The
Catholic Historical Review

VOLUME IV OCTOBER, 1918 NUMBER 3

STEPHEN GIRARD[1]

I

Stephen Girard—"mariner and merchant," banker and patriot, philanthropist and freemason—died on December 26th, 1831, and four days later was buried in the Catholic graveyard of Holy Trinity Church, Philadelphia.

This statement obviously violates a fundamental canon of biography, for the biographer should undoubtedly get his hero born before having him buried. Its madness is not without method, however, in the present instance; for Catholics have a peculiar interest, which to others may seem uncanny, in the death and burial of a man who had been born, baptized and reared in the Catholic faith, and who nevertheless had become a member of a Masonic lodge and was considered in some quarters to have practically, if not indeed formally, given up his belief in revealed religion. Under date of December 30th, 1831, Bishop Kenrick devotes an unusually generous amount of space in his *Diary*[2] to the explanation of two notable facts in connection with the funeral of Girard: first, that the freemasons in the procession were forbidden entrance to the church because they would not remove the insignia of their order, and so there was no religious rite performed; second, that Girard's body was permitted interment in consecrated ground for a reason which the Bishop gives.

[1] *The Life and Times of Stephen Girard, Mariner and Merchant.* By JOHN BACH MCMASTER, Professor of American History, University of Pennsylvania. With illustrations in color and doubletone. Vol. I, 470 pp.; Vol. II, 482 pp. Philadelphia and London: J. B. Lippincott Company. 1918.

[2] *Diary and Visitation Record of the Rt. Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick,* 1831–1851. Translated and Edited by F. E. T. [The Rev. F. E. Tourscher, O. S. A.]. Lancaster, Pa., 1916.

In addition to this, Girard living has less interest for us than Girard "dead and turn'd to clay," because of two curious and withal fairly significant facts. The spokesman for the freemasons in their refusal to remove their insignia in Holy Trinity Church was Francis Cooper, who subsequently embraced the Catholic faith. And when, twenty years after (1851), Girard's body was removed from the little God's acre of Holy Trinity Church and was reinterred with Masonic rites in the marble sarcophagus prepared for it in Girard College, the orator of the occasion was the Hon. Joseph R. Chandler, who also subsequently embraced the Catholic faith. Girard, the Catholic, became a Mason; and Cooper and Chandler, the Masons, became Catholics. Had St. Basil's ancient narrative of the Forty Martyrs a modern application?

The next point of interest to Catholics would naturally be the steps in the pathway that led Girard from the faith of his forebears into the philosophism of that eighteenth century which, said Carlyle, blew its brains out in the French Revolution. Of the fleet of vessels that ploughed the Seven Seas in obedience to the shrewd and unflagging commercial instinct of Girard, he himself had named four with the significant titles of *Voltaire*, *Rousseau*, *Montesquieu* and *Helvetius*. An orator at the celebration of the sesqui-centennial of Girard's birthday declared that the great mariner and merchant had a special devotion to this quartet of philosophers—a fair inference, doubtless, from the namings of the four vessels, but still an inference which leaves us wondering how Girard found any leisure for an extensive acquaintance with such a large literature in the midst of his incessant business cares.

Not Catholics alone, but all believers in Christianity as well, should be deeply concerned in two questions that arise in connection with Girard College, to whose founding and maintenance Girard devoted the greater portion of his immense fortune. He left in his will a provision "that no ecclesiastic, missionary, or minister of any sect whatsoever, shall ever hold or exercise any station or duty whatever in the said College; nor shall any such person ever be admitted for any purpose, or as a visitor, within the premises appropriated to the purposes of the said College." Girard forthwith added his reason for this restriction. But just here the first question would arise as to his real intent, as Daniel

Webster argued constructively in his famous three-day speech before the Supreme Court of the United States in the attempt to break this part of the will. The second question would concern itself with the practical working out of the restriction in the history of the College.

Finally, the least point of interest for Catholics will probably be the details of the long and active commercial life of the "mariner and merchant."

II

It is the last point—the one which has the least meaning for Catholics as such—that receives virtually exclusive treatment in the two large and beautiful volumes of *The Life and Times of Stephen Girard, Mariner and Merchant*, by John Bach McMaster, Professor of American History in the University of Pennsylvania. The other points that would most of all interest us are either overlooked or but slightly treated. The funeral of Girard is of course described, but from the narrative a reader would naturally infer that the procession had no intention of entering the church, for Bishop Kenrick's name is not mentioned, nor is the incident recorded in his *Diary*, even hinted at. With respect to the will of Girard, its many sections are summarized briefly, with the exception of the portion prohibiting clergymen from ever entering the College, which is given fully, together with the reason assigned by Girard. But there is no suggestion of the strenuous efforts made to break the will because of this proscriptive provision, nor is any account given of the manner in which that provision has been actually interpreted in the history of the College. Again, no estimate is attempted of Girard's attitude towards religion. Finally, there is of course no account of the re-interment (1851) of Girard's remains in the College sarcophagus, inasmuch as the record closes with the year 1838.

What has just been said is not meant as adverse criticism of the *Life*, but simply as an indication of the nature and scope of the laborious work undertaken by Professor McMaster. A laborious work, truly:

> Material for the story of the life of Girard as mariner, merchant and banker is abundant. The Girard manuscripts number more than 50,000 pieces. Of these, 14,000 are contained in his office letter books and represent his side of a voluminous correspondence. Some 36,000 are

> letters from his captains, supercargoes, agents, correspondents in every seaport of Europe from Petrograd to Trieste, in China, in the East Indies, in South American ports, from correspondents in our own country and from bankers in Europe, Great Britain and at home. The remainder of the manuscripts consist of ships' papers, documents relating to trials in prize courts, prices current, and papers treating of matters not connected with his mercantile affairs.

Here is more than sufficient material for two volumes that should attempt a delineation merely of the business career of an octogenarian mariner, merchant and banker. We can hardly expect to find a man's soul between the entries of his ledger or the lines of his commercial correspondence. And doubtless the biographer deemed it wise virtually to restrict his inquiry to the "world's work" performed by such a sagacious and industrious man of affairs as Girard. Professor McMaster's splendid contributions to American History fitted him adequately to interpret aright the atmosphere of the times in which Girard carried on his extensive businesses:

> The value of these papers is greatly enhanced by the extraordinary character of the times in which he lived. He came to our country just before the opening of the War for Independence, and during that war engaged in two privateering ventures which ended disastrously. After the peace he traded with French San Domingo until the massacre of the whites by the negroes and the establishment of the present negro Republic of Haiti put an end to all trade. Turning to Europe in 1793, just when France became a Republic and made war on Great Britain and brought on the world war of 1793–1815, he suffered, as did the other American merchants, from the plundering French Decrees and British Orders in Council. One after another his ships and his cargoes were seized by the French, by the British, by the Swedes and the Danes (*Preface*).

"Old events have modern meanings," sings James Russell Lowell; and the World War of today seems to be an echo of that here described. The story is not wholly commercial in character. Its greatest interest lies in the fact that Girard's many correspondents sent fairly full accounts of those happenings of international importance which a venturesome merchant in America would wish to know about. As to his banking business:

> He . . . became the first private banker in our country, and rose rapidly to importance in national finance. His letters . . . show how, with David Parish, by his great subscription he enabled the Govern-

> ment to float a loan of $16,000,000 for which the people of the entire country had not subscribed 50 per cent. When the second Bank of the United States was chartered, and the stock did not sell, it was his subscription of $3,000,000 that made it possible for the directors to complete the organization of the Bank and begin business (*Preface*).

The quite long Preface summarizes beautifully the commercial and financial career to which almost all of the more than 900 large pages of the *Life* are devoted, and makes it unnecessary for a reviewer to attempt, within restricted limits of space, to retell the long story with any pretense of detail. The sketches of Girard in cyclopaedias need to be corrected in many points, it is true; but they give a not unsatisfactory account of the businesses of Girard. In lieu, therefore, of attempting such a task, we may content ourselves with comment on the things that most interest us.

The *Life and Times* of Girard—but it is the *Times* rather than the *Life*. For Girard's replies to his voluble correspondents are the least interesting features of the narrative. They speak humanly—he replies like a machine. They dilate on the tremendous events they have witnessed with their own eyes—he coldly draws a business inference from their information. They rhetorize—he calculates. Their main thought is like his—cargoes, prices, custom-houses and prize-courts. But they appear to be human beings withal, while Girard seems to click like a National Cash Register. He is brief, direct, cool, precise. He is wholly a man of business. As such, his transactions are clear indexes of the times, and are of special value to the historian and the economist.

Yet the soul of Girard is not to be found between the lines of his correspondence, but rather in his splendid activities during the epidemics of yellow-fever. A generous mist blurs the pages from our eyes, as we read of his heroism, his patience, his self-sacrifice in those most trying visitations of the city wherein he had made his home. The *Life* tells us something of all this, it is true, for it forms a part of Girard's life. But it is merely incidental, after all, in a narrative whose main concern is with commerce. It may not unfairly be deemed significant of the purpose of the two volumes that in the Preface which so well summarizes the business activities of Girard, no mention is made of that which dignifies his whole life with immeasurably greater importance than his merchandizing and his banking, namely his heroic labors in behalf of the

poor wretches who had been stricken with the fever. Despite his mask of philosophic calm, Girard was human after all—not least so in his savage attacks on the physicians of his day; and so we take heart of grace to continue reading the dull pages that tell us abundantly of his rise to wealth and prominence.

III

The statement just made concerning dull pages should be doubly qualified. First, the question of dullness must be answered by everyone's personal tastes and interests. Mariners and merchants, historians and economists, beneficiaries under the provisions of Girard's will, and Philadelphians in general, may properly be expected to find a special and peculiar interest in the story of Girard. But secondly, there are in addition some kindly touches of nature, some romantic incidents and romantic phraseology, some humor that creeps out of the pages beyond the intent of the historian or of the actors in the story.

Girard, for instance, again and again exhibits brotherly concern for the folk he had left at home in France. He writes to an agent in Bordeaux "to use my interests for the benefit of my sister Victoire until further orders from me" (I. 150). He gave to her and to his Aunt Lafargue the use of the house in which he believed himself to have been born (I. 458) and in addition furnished them with an annual allowance (I. 459). His nieces, Antoinette aged nine, Caroline aged seven and Henriette aged five, came to his house in Water Street "almost naked," he said, in search of a home. He received them, put them under the care of his housekeeper, and sent the two eldest to a boarding school (I. 463). He showed like kindness to the children of his brother Etienne, paying for the education of his daughters in France and for that of his two sons in America (II. 361). But Girard's heart was not closed to all others. He received into his house Peter Seguin, a young Irishman in the employ of a Bordeaux firm, and personally nursed him in his last illness (I. 221). He offered to act as a father to the son of his former agent, Samatan, after the latter's death (I. 269). He orders one of his captains, Lillibridge, to treat the crew and passengers "with the greatest humanity, also to take good care of the sick and whenever some preference is unavoidable to give it to children, women and ancients. Among the

plentiful provisions which you have on board there is two firkins of butter which I beg you will give out to the poor passengers" (I. 364). And after the fall of Napoleon, Girard gave succor to several prominent French exiles. His interest in the people stricken with the "plague" in its various visits to Philadelphia need only be alluded to. In connection with his work in assuaging the terrible suffering of these visitations, there are touches of nature that make the whole world kin in a sense better than Shakespeare meant in his oft-quoted phrase. He was throughout a modest hero, and withal a humorous one. Writing to a friend he says:

> During all this excitement I remained in the city and, without mixing in politics, played a part that would make you laugh. Can you believe it, my dear friend, I visited as many as fifteen sick a day, and what will surprise you more I lost only one patient, an Irishman who indulged a little in drink. I do not suppose I cured one, nevertheless, you will agree with me that in my capacity as Physician of Philadelphia I have been very moderate and that no one of my confreres has killed less than I (I. 376).

The reference to the physicians of Philadelphia recalls his outbursts of indignation against them in the previous plague of 1793 (I. 218). In the next visitation he refers to the "College of Physicians, or rather jackasses" (I. 345) and again speaks of "our infamous Esculapians, who have the impertinence to call themselves physicians" (I. 347). Again the fever came, and Girard, in breathing-spells between his labors, again attacks them as having "for the third time, lost their wits" and as being "poor imbeciles" (I. 374). Hard on the doctors then resident in Philadelphia —but still a not unpleasing human trait in a character that we have traditionally considered as self-centered, close, unfeeling.

There is also in the narrative a humor not intended, but perceptible to a reader who connects some incidents appropriately. Its text might well be the story of a backwoodsman who visited a city for the first time and wondered how the folk there made a living. "They live by cheating one another," answered a friend. Thus when Girard's brother Jean asked Stephen to collect some money due to Jean "on the shore of Casco Bay, Boston and elsewhere," Stephen replied that bills of exchange on New England had little credit in Philadelphia, because the people of New England were "somewhat given to sharp practices" (I. 20). On the

other hand, when Girard's privateer, the *Minerva*, was forced to put into Horn Town, Chincoteague, Virginia, he ordered the captain to store all her furniture on shore with some honest man; whereupon the good captain replied that unfortunately an honest man was as hard to find in Horn Town "as virtue in the present contest" (I. 22). Honesty must have been in hiding in San Domingo as well as in Virginia and in New England, for we find agents of Girard suspecting others of his agents of dishonest action in having *The Whim* condemned "and thereby gaining more profit for themselves." And so the little schooner was the subject of "a knavish trick" on the part of those who had a trust in her regard (I. 26). At St. Eustache, a partner of Girard stocked his vessel with provisions, only to find that those who sold him the fish cheated in the weight (I. 27). Girard may have disliked lawyers as much as he did physicians. "The intolerable avarice" of one of his lawyers surprised him, and the lawyer's apparent neglect of Girard's case made him indignant (I. 42). A "deputy-marshall, too, had taken advantage of him" (I. 43). When the schooner *William and Polly* was seized and taken to the York River, the hands ran off and "left her plundered of anchors, cables and sails. The purchaser of the barge disappeared" (I. 45).

The people of those days lived "by cheating one another." Girard was a smuggler himself and a deviser of ways that are dark and tricks that, in one notable instance (I. 115–118), were vain. Flour could not be imported into Le Cap. And so Jean writes Stephen that "the best way was not to declare it or have it on the permit. Then it could be landed very quietly. At present flour could be brought in only by declaring there was none on board. Consequently American captains were forced to do so"—not a "military" but a "commercial" *necessity*, as it were, in the language of diplomacy (I. 52). The reader will be entertained by the tricks that had to be resorted to (I. 55–60) to carry on the profession of smuggler. The tricks included lying (as in the instructions of Girard to Captain Edger, I. 91), official declarations "quite different from the cargo" (I. 117), "gratifications for the Custom House inspectors" (I. 118), counterfeit passports (I. 141), "camouflaged" ownership (I. 174), "camouflaged" consignees (I. 69), and the like. As smuggling was a perfectly honorable commercial

transaction, we are not surprised that when the Colonial Assembly allowed the *Polly* to sail from Port-au-Prince only after a rigorous inspection and heavy assessment of duties, the fact should have been announced to Girard in the following indignant terms by his agents:

> The rigorous inspection of American vessels practiced by officials on land, as well as by men-of-war, obliges them to truly declare their cargoes. We are extremely sorry for the injury to interests by this wanton event (I. 133).

The profiteers of the present day must similarly consider as "wanton" the investigations undertaken or proposed by Congress into their methods of conducting patriotic commercial enterprises.

Professor McMaster has rarely any comment to make. He lets the correspondence tell the story for the reader's own interpretation. But the reader may become confused at times, as he has not the whole of the correspondence under inspection. What, for instance, shall we make of these two extracts? Stephen received a letter from his father, dated July 29th, 1785, containing a list of nine creditors of Stephen's with the amount due to each:

> Girard made no reply and when pressed by his brother for an answer declared that he would make no reply to his father's letter concerning the Bordeaux creditors. "If these men are, as he says, *fools enough to send their power of attorney here, I will give them all the trouble possible* and will not pay them for several years."

We read this set forth on page 66. Nevertheless we find Stephen (on page 153) writing as follows:

> I asked M. Gaube to pay these creditors . . . I never refused to pay them, and since I came here *requested them to send their power of attorney, so that I might settle with their representatives.* [3]

IV

The *Life* rarely comments on the panorama displayed by the correspondence it quotes. It may be of interest to note here some of the comment.

Girard formed two partnerships in his early commercial life,

[3] I have italicised the apparent contradiction in the letters. In the second letter Girard argues against paying interest on his debts, "which could not be just, as I never refused to pay them, and since I came here requested them to send their power of attorney," etc. A very curious argument, indeed, against the paying of interest.

and soon dissolved both. The first was with "M. Baldesqui, captain in the corps of Pulaski." It did not prosper, and ended in mutual recriminations. "Volatile, unstable, too prone to give advice, wanting in all that leads to business success," Baldesqui "was not the sort of man to be a partner with Girard" (I. 35). But neither, apparently, was his brother Jean this "sort of man," for the partnership formed with him also came to "a rupture of all business relations between the brothers" (I. 104). Girard seemed kinder in single than in double harness. His biographer Simpson insinuates that perhaps he did not get along well with his wife, and for much the same reason; but Simpson is a discredited man, an unpromoted clerk of Girard's, who "avenged himself by writing a biography, false by deliberate intent and by lack of information" (*Preface*). Ingram spends several pages in proofs that Girard's marriage was a happy one until his wife's mind became affected. The *Life* does not discuss the matter—a pity, as it seems to us, since the popular tradition still exists.

The first assistance rendered by Girard to his sister Victoire and his Aunt Lafargue was thankfully received, "small as was the pittance" (I. 151).

Girard was stoical in respect of his several large losses in his foreign commercial ventures. His "philosophers" doubtless helped him here considerably. But the reader is tempted to think there was also something cynical at times in his stoicism. Answering a melancholy letter from his brother Jean, he wrote: "I am sorry that trifles grieve and annoy you so much" (I. 181). Nevertheless, at this time Stephen's affairs were not going very prosperously, and he contemplated retiring from business. The *Life* hereupon comments excellently: "His troubles and annoyances were small in comparison with those of his brother who had lost business, money, property and slaves" (I. 182).

V

Girard's activities as mariner, merchant and banker form the main preoccupation of the *Life*, and accordingly the reader may not complain of the almost total absence of items having a religious bearing. Still, if such items were obtainable, it seems a pity that they should not have been included. They might have thrown some light on the curious provision of the will excluding

clergymen from the College—a greatly debated matter since his death. What little information can be gleaned in the pages of the two volumes can be properly set forth here.

> On the fifteenth of February, 1748, so runs the record at Bordeaux, after the celebration of the betrothal and the publication of one ban, my lord, the archbishop, having granted a dispensation suspending publication of the other two, no opposition having been made and no impediment having been discovered, the vicar of St. Seurin united in marriage, and gave the wedding benediction to, Pierre Girard, Port Captain, and Odette Lafargue, *habitante* of the parish of St. Remy, all of which was duly witnessed and the certificate signed by the sexton, the bell ringer and the clerk of the vestry room.
>
> From this marriage in the course of fourteen years came ten children, of whom the second child and eldest son was named Etienne in honor of his godfather Souisse, a burgess of Bordeaux. Etienne, or Stephen, was born on the twentieth of May, 1750, and baptized the next day in St. Seurin, one of the three churches in Bordeaux in which baptism was permitted. Concerning his early life nothing, or next to nothing, is known (I. 1).

Stephen's mother died when he was twelve years old. Two years later, he became a cabin-boy in a ship in which his father had a venture, and in 1773 he was licensed to act as captain, master or pilot of merchant ships, and the following year sailed as "officer of the ship" from Bordeaux to Port-au-Prince. He had a slight venture in the cargo, merchandise he had purchased with notes of hand. He lost 25 per cent on the sale of the wares, and fearing to return to Bordeaux unable to pay for them, he went to New York with merchandise purchased with the money obtained from the sale of his Bordeaux goods. From New York he made several voyages, finally became captain of a vessel, and "his little capital was steadily growing when the fights at Concord and Lexington opened the war between the mother country and her colonies" (I. 3).

Stephen's father did not like the way in which the son appeared to be avoiding payment of his just debts, and wrote him a letter in which he commented upon this and also expressed parental anxiety as to the religious conduct of Stephen. With respect to the debts, Stephen replied that the distance between himself and his father would not cause him to forget his creditors, and expressed a hope that "with the help of God" he would soon be in a position to realize his desire to return to Bordeaux with sufficient

funds. His treatment of the religious question deserves to be quoted:

> I received with a lively joy several of your letters, the last dated May 22, 1775, which I cannot read without shedding torrents of tears at the thought of your love for me. Letters like yours are fountains of intelligence, virtue and probity to a dutiful son. As to remembering the religion in which I was born, as you bid me do, I shall never forget the pains you took to bring me up according to its precepts (*Life*, I. 6).

Stephen was at that time twenty-five years old, mature, intelligent and self-confident. The fortunes of war caused Girard to bring his ship into Philadelphia in June, 1776, and thus began his career of fifty-five years in that commercial metropolis of America. A year later he "married Mary Lum." The *Life* does not tell us who she was, where the marriage was celebrated, who the officiating clergyman was. Our natural curiosity on these points, however, is satisfied abundantly by Henry Atlee Ingram in his *Life and Character of Stephen Girard*. Mary was the daughter of a ship-builder who was "widely known in Philadelphia as a plain and reputable man." The marriage ceremony took place in "St. Paul's Protestant Episcopal Church, on Third Street, below Walnut, in the city of Philadelphia," and the clergyman was the Rev. Mr. Stringer. It would seem that Stephen, despite the anxious injunctions of his father and the promise made by the son, had already grown cold towards "the religion in which I was born . . . and its precepts." More than a year after the marriage, the father complained that only from Stephen's brother had he heard of the "personal change" in Stephen's life. The reply of the son appears rather shifty and evasive:

> You ask for information in regard to the circumstances attending the personal affair that I have recently been concerned in here. The silence I have observed in regard to it up to the present time you must attribute to the natural bashfulness of a son who, though far from his father, fears to incur his displeasure [Stephen was quite bashful, being only twenty-nine years old and a seasoned man of the world]; but since it is your wish, I will tell you about it in detail. Tired of the risks of a sailor's life and accompanying libertinage without religious control, I determined to settle ashore in order to keep what was left of the fruits of several years' toil. As I could hardly do this without marrying, I have taken a wife who is without fortune, it is true, but whom I love and with whom I am living very happily (I. 19).

There is much verbiage here, but none of the "detail" he declares he is going to impart to his father, who might well enjoin "more matter with less art" on this modern Polonius. In brief, the news the father had heard was correct; the son was married. Girard senior was a good Catholic, and doubtless would have wished to know—as indeed the Catholic reader of the *Life* would also wish to know—something of the religious side of the marriage.

The incident of religious interest next recorded (I. 81) is that, during a stay of five weeks in Charleston, Stephen was made a Master Mason in the Union Blue Lodge No. 8, under the jurisdiction of the Grand Lodge of Ancient York Masons. This was in 1787.

However strongly Stephen was drifting away from his religious moorings, the fact could have hardly been noticeable externally, as in 1792 his brother Jean writes a letter containing the pious sentiment—which evidently he expected Stephen to share—in respect of San Domingo: "God have pity on it, and may He at least put me in a position to take up my work there once more" (I. 168). "Perhaps," writes[4] the present rector of Holy Trinity Church, "the famed philanthropist-millionaire had not always been so neglectful of his religious duties, for in the baptismal register of Father Peter Helbron is found the signature of 'Stephen Girard' as sponsor to a child, that was baptized 19 December, 1795." Dr. Thompson S. Westcott, in his *Sketch of the History of St. Augustine's Church*,[5] mentions some of the contributors to the building fund of the church, in 1796. These included non-Catholics (President George Washington, Governor Thomas McKean, etc.) and Catholics, among whom he includes Stephen Girard, who gave $40. In 1810, Girard also is mentioned[6] as giving $100 to the fund for the Alteration and Improvement of St. Mary's Church.

Writing to his brother Jean in 1793, Stephen says, "I am incapable of giving orders that would disappoint you . . . One cannot help agreeing with Dr. Pangloss. These little lessons teach us to know mankind. I am sorry to hear that you are not as patient as you ought to be." The reference to Dr. Pangloss is the

[4] *A Retrospect of Holy Trinity Parish*, 1789–1914, p. 86.

[5] Printed in the *Records* of the American Catholic Historical Society, I. 167.

[6] *American Catholic Historical Researches*, XIII, 190.

only one,[7] in all the nine hundred pages of the *Life*, that suggests any reading by Girard in the literature of Voltaire or of any of the four worthies after whom he names four of his vessels—the *Voltaire, Rousseau, Helvetius, Montesquieu.* Meanwhile, writing to an agent in 1797, he is pious enough to say: "Thank God, I have not much merchandise in the warehouse, but on the other hand all my vessels are out with valuable cargoes which run the greatest possible risks" (I. 358). It may mean little—the oft-used phrase—but its rarity in the correspondence may justify its quotation here. "Dr. Pangloss" may have accounted for his naming of a vessel the *Voltaire.* A friend wrote him suggesting that his next ship be called the "Jean Jacques," and he named it the *Rousseau.* In 1803 he wrote to an agent about a new vessel: "As I have already two philosophers, I have named this ship *Helvetius*" (II. 6). Why the *Montesquieu* was so named the *Life* does not tell us. Neither can we surmise how deeply read Girard was in his four philosophers. Certainly, Pangloss is his favorite: "By this you will observe," he writes to a correspondent in 1816, "that our financial business goes on as Pangloss says, everything for the best, and the United States will receive a substantial bonus" (II. 313).

The marriage of Girard's niece, Henriette, to General Lallemand, is thus mentioned in the *Life* (II. 338): "The brothers Lallemand went by another vessel to New Orleans. Before leaving, Henri Lallemand was married with much ceremony, in the presence of the Comte de Survilliers and many French officers of rank, to Henriette Girard." The marriage took place "with

[7] The reference to "Dr. Pangloss" occurs again in a letter of Girard's printed in the *Life* (II. 313). The *Life* does not, of course, print all of his letters, or quote all of such letters as it prints. We are left to surmise whether Girard really paid much court to his four philosophers, or whether mayhap Voltaire was the only one with whom he had much of a reading acquaintance.

In his biography, Simpson remarks that "In one corner of his bed-chamber stood an old-fashioned small mahogany desk and book-case, in which was contained his library of Voltaire's works" (2nd edition, p. 187), and "among the furniture of his common sitting-room are two elegant busts of Voltaire and Rousseau" (p. 177); and Simpson thinks "it is probable that he had read some of the works of Rousseau and a little of Helvetius" (*ib.*). On the other hand, one can hardly agree with the softer inference of George E. Rupp in the biographical sketch contributed to the *Statue of Stephen Girard*, etc. (Philadelphia, 1897, p. 95): "The names of these ships show that he still had an affectionate regard for his native land." On the contrary, Girard professed to have no interest whatever in his native land, evidently agreeing with Cicero that a man's fatherland is where he is well off.

much ceremony"; but the *Life* might have added that it took place with a religious ceremony in the Catholic church of St. Augustine, Philadelphia. Girard of course was present, with Joseph Bonaparte, the Count de Grouchy, and other distinguished French exiles. General Henry Lallemand died in 1822 and was buried in Holy Trinity churchyard, Sixth and Spruce Streets. In 1829 his widow married Dr. Joseph Y. Clark, the ceremony being performed also in St. Augustine's Church.

The next items of possible interest to us are recorded evidently in a humorous spirit, but some of them will illustrate the views then generally held that Girard was a Catholic of good will. His subscription of $3,000,000 in 1816 to cover the stock deficit of the Second Bank of the United States "seems to have spread his reputation for great wealth not only over all the United States but even abroad, and brought down on him scores of applications for help from his connections and men who knew him not." After some enlightening instances, the *Life* continues (II. 362):

> Now it is an appeal for a subscription to pay the debt of St. Matthew's Church, Boston; now for help to the Roman Catholic Church at Cincinnati . . . Sister Rose appeals to him to aid St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City, and reminds him that "our good God who has permitted your coffers to fill with such immense sums will one day demand the use you made of them. Life if [query: *is?*] but a moment; eternity no end. Alms cover a multitude of sins."

In the summer of 1820 Philadelphia was again visited by yellow fever. "With a view to allay the alarm in the country round about the city, Girard prepared a resolution to be introduced in Select Council," in which he speaks of certain precautions "having with the blessing of Providence proved effectual" (II. 369).

The *Life* records (II. 378) that in 1821 Girard was still beset with appeals from places and people he had never heard of "and from churches of several denominations." "The only appeal which seems to have received a reply was one from President Monroe . . ." If we may trust Simpson in his *Biography*, Girard was more yielding to personal solicitation. Several instances of generous giving to non-Catholic churches are recorded in illustration, however, less of his generosity than of his personal peculiarities. Anecdotes are rarely trustworthy, but may refresh us at times.

> When the Baptist church was building in Sansom street, Doctor Staughton waited upon him, in behalf of the congregation, to obtain some aid towards its erection. Girard received him, as he did all others, on similar errands, with cold but marked courtesy; and without hesitation presented him with a check for five hundred dollars. Doctor Staughton received it with a low bow, expecting a donation of at least one thousand; but when he perused it, he affected the greatest astonishment. "*Only* five hundred dollars, Mr. Girard! surely you will not give us less than a thousand dollars." "Let me see the check, Mr. Staughton," replied Girard—"perhaps I have made one mistake"; upon which the Doctor returned him the check, when Girard, with the utmost sangfroid, cancelled it into fragments—observing, "Well, Mr. Staughton, if you will not have what I give, I will give nothing." The Doctor left him, overcome with chagrin and mortification.

On the other hand, a modest appeal from the Episcopalian Methodists was interrupted by Girard's handing the solicitor a check for five hundred dollars. The congregation was struggling to erect a plain church. Subsequently to this the Protestant Episcopalians, desiring to build a costly edifice, received a check for the same amount. They represented to Girard that they expected more, as they were to build a very fine church. Girard tore the check up, saying: "I will not contribute *one cent.* Your society is wealthy—the Methodists are poor—but I make no distinction; yet I cannot please you."

More authentic than these anecdotes were the suggestions made towards the end of Girard's life by those who were interested in the disposition of his fortune. The *Life* records several interesting ones, and among these are found: "Infant schools and Sabbath Schools," the "education of young men to the gospel ministry," and the "sending forth missionaries to the Heathen" (II. 432).

The penultimate chapter of the *Life* covers fifty pages and is entitled "The Last Years." One will turn to it hopefully, but in vain, for a single item of religious interest. The pages are still filled with commercial activities. Even the eighty-second year of Girard's life was crowded with his customary businesses and interests. Among these was his railroad in Schuylkill County, Pennsylvania. We are quietly reading about it in the *Life* when suddenly, without warning, we come upon this paragraph:

> December 20th he wrote again to Mr. Boyd concerning the railroad. The day following he was taken ill and died of pneumonia, at a quarter past four on the afternoon of the twenty-sixth (II. 443).

In one brief sentence, forming the second half of an exceedingly brief paragraph, we find the complete record of Girard's last illness and death. Immediately after this we read that "letters were at once sent off to his correspondents and agents in the South bidding them stop purchasing on his account." With such business-like dispatch is "old Girard" hurried away from this earthly scene.

The concluding chapter of the *Life* gives a too brief account of the funeral, a selection from the newspaper comment of the time, and a summary of the will and of the record of the estate as it stood in 1838, when "the auditors of the accounts of the Executors reported."

Girard's benefactions were many, varied and widespread. They are succinctly mentioned in the brief notices of Girard in the encyclopedias and need not be repeated here. The will has been frequently printed in full, sometimes with a so-called "biography" attached, which details Girard's life with ludicrous inexactitude. An excellently edited pamphlet was issued by the Board of Directors of City Trusts of Philadelphia in 1889, which gives in full the will and codicil together with six Acts of Assembly and nine legal decisions concerning the will.

VI

Among the varied bequests of Girard's will the greatest interest has always attached to the provision for the establishment of a College for the education and maintenance of "poor white male orphans" who should be admitted according to the following scheme of preferences: first, those born in the city of Philadelphia; secondly, those born in any other part of Pennsylvania; thirdly, those born in the city of New York ("that being the first port on the Continent of North America at which I arrived"); lastly, those born in the city of New Orleans ("being the first port on the said continent at which I first traded, in the first instance as first officer, and subsequently as master and part owner of a vessel and cargo").

The will goes into curiously minute details of the construction and arrangements of the buildings and of the qualifications for admission. But the provision forever debarring clergymen from any association with the management of the College and even

from ever entering upon its premises has proved the one detail which made the College and its founder famous—or notorious—throughout the civilized world. The *Life* does not hint at the legal contentions or the religious controversies that were begotten of the provision, but in succinctly summarizing the exceedingly long will very properly quotes in full the restrictive words and Girard's *apologia* therefor. They may well be repeated here:

> *Secondly*, I enjoin and require that *no ecclesiastic, missionary, or minister of any sect whatsoever, shall ever hold or exercise any station or duty whatever in the said College; nor shall any such person ever be admitted for any purpose, or as a visitor within the premises appropriated to the purposes of the said College.* In making this restriction, I do not mean to cast any reflection upon any sect or any person whatsoever; but, as there is such a multitude of sects, and such a diversity of opinion amongst them, I desire to keep the tender minds of the orphans, who are to derive advantage from this bequest, free from the excitement, which clashing doctrines and sectarian controversy are so apt to produce: My desire is, that all the instructors and teachers in the College shall take pains to instill into the minds of the scholars *the purest principles of morality*, so that, on their entrance into active life, they may from *inclination and habit*, evince *benevolence towards their fellow creatures*, and *a love of truth, sobriety, and industry*, adopting at the same time such religious tenets as their *matured reason* may enable them to prefer.

In thus quoting from the will, I have thought it proper to give italics as they appear in the *Will and Codicil of the Late Stephen Girard, Esq.*, issued by the Board of Directors of City Trusts (Philadelphia, 1889). The *Life* does not italicise.

The will was fully published in the *United States Gazette* of January 2, 1832, and thenceforth the newspapers teemed with controversies over the exclusion of clergymen from the College. Bishop White, of the Protestant Episcopal Church, elaborately discussed the question whether the acceptance of the bequest could be reconciled with belief in Christianity or with the principles of the Constitution. A writer in the *Pennsylvania Whig* charged the clergy in general with "assailing Mr. Girard's memory with the tongue of slander and the shafts of ridicule."

Although the controversies have for us now only a historical interest, as the points at issue have long since been practically settled by various decisions of the courts, there are nevertheless some interesting features in the views entertained by Father John Hughes and Bishop England which may appropriately be noted here.

To the arguments of the writer in the *Whig*, Hughes published a rejoinder, over the signature of "Fenelon," in the *United States Gazette* of February 25, 1832. Fearing a controversy, he wrote to Father Bruté, asking for advice and expressing his very great doubt "of the expediency of attacking the will openly, or entering into any public discussion of the merits of its provisions," on the score that excellent argumentation would "stand but a poor chance before an interested tribunal of this semi-infidel community, when opposed to an argument of from two to five millions of dollars." He described the bequest as "the *infidel fund* bequeathed by Girard," and feared that it might give the first decided impulse to a spirit of reaction, "of which religion itself will be the victim," against "the extent of abuse to which the exaction of money for fanatical purposes has been carried" by the "*parsons*" of his day:

> For my own part, although I regret that he has excluded religion, still I should have been sorry if he had left a prey to the voracious mongrels of heresy who, under the plea of propagating religion, are absolutely attempting to devour everything. It was not, however, the abuses which are carried on under pretext of religion that Girard wished to exclude, but, as I have it from his niece (by a species of confidence), his intention was to originate means for the gradual extinction of Christianity in this country, and to strip man of every attribute except such as become a mere operative and productive animal.

What, indeed, was Girard's intent? I have a vague memory of having somewhere read the contention that he feared lest his will should be broken if he had placed his College under Catholic auspices, and was determined that it should never become the prey of "the voracious mongrels of heresy"—to quote the strong expression of Father Hughes. But the view of his niece—(which niece was it? and how did she so confidently gauge the intent of a man who, as the *Life* several times witnesses, strove to keep his intimate concerns from the knowledge of all save those who must help him to achieve his projects?)—flatly contradicts this contention. In their *History of Philadelphia* (II. 1605-6), Scharf and Westcott refer to the plague of 1793 and declare that "In the experience of this remarkable man, some things must have occurred of a striking character which led to the hostility which later in life he felt toward ministers of the gospel . . . and it must have been that some of the clergymen, when so many of their flocks had fled,

persuaded themselves that it was a greater duty to go in pursuit of the wanderers than remain and perish among the poor, and so leave the former to roam without shepherds." But as against the conjecture of the unfaithful shepherds, there is the record of the clergymen who nobly died as martyrs to duty—four ministers of as many denominations, four preachers of the Society of Friends, and two Catholic priests (Fathers Graessel and Fleming). Other hypotheses are that Girard had had unfortunate relations with certain clergymen; or that he especially disliked certain sects; or that he really meant what he said in his will, namely, that "as there is such a multitude of sects, and such a diversity of opinion amongst them, I desire to keep the tender minds of the orphans . . . free from the excitement which clashing doctrines and sectarian controversy are so apt to produce."

More to the point than the views of Father Hughes were those contributed, doubtless by Bishop England, to the *United States Catholic Miscellany* of 28 January, 1832 (page 246), under the heading of "Girard's Will." The writer forecasts quite shrewdly the actual course of events, saying *inter alia:*

> That the provisions of the will could be executed according to the intention of the testator, is out of the question; and the impossibility is already obvious. . . . Men who were practical believers in revealed religion, would be conscientiously obliged to decline undertaking what revealed religion condemns as an immoral and mischievous system; but we have no expectation of having the fund thus abandoned. The booty is too tempting. An effort will be made, and perhaps successfully, to have a semblance of religion and a semblance of fulfilment of the trust . . . and thereby upon something like the doctrines of *epikeia* or *cy pres*, under the semblance of conformity, the testator's object will be eluded. For strict conformity is impossible. Another instance of the same ingenuity is observable in the manner in which [a certain editor] endeavors to secure the whole of the demoralizing bequest for Pennsylvania, by construing the word "orphan" to be intended as a description of a child, one of whose parents is dead.

With respect to the definition of "orphan," the first Board of Trustees, acting with legal advice, construed the term to mean "a Fatherless child," and this construction became the rule thenceforth governing admission to the College. The popular view that an orphan is a child both of whose parents are dead was recently illustrated in an article contributed to the *Philadelphia Public*

Ledger (16 June, 1918) by Lady Beatty, wife of Admiral Beatty of the British Navy, in her expression "*half* orphan" to describe a child whose father had been killed in the war: "Not only have the half orphans of the war lost their fathers—they have lost their future."

With respect to the ethical doctrine of *epikeia* or the legal one of *cy pres*, the question will properly be raised as to the true intent of Girard in excluding clergymen from his College and expressing a desire that "the purest principles of morality" etc., should be inculcated therein. Did Girard plan an infidel institution? Daniel Webster's famous plea before the Supreme Court of the United States in 1844 failed to do more than contribute a new page to the glowing defence of Christianity, for the Court decided this portion of the pleading as follows:

> The exclusion of all ecclesiastics, missionaries, and ministers of any sort from holding or exercising any station or duty in the college, or even visiting the same; or the limitation of the instruction to be given to the scholars, to pure morality, general benevolence, a love of truth, sobriety, and industry, are not so derogatory and hostile to the Christian religion as to make a devise for the foundation of such a college void according to the Constitution and Laws of Pennsylvania.

Justice Story, who delivered the opinion of the Court, wrote to Chancellor Kent that "Webster did his best for the other side, but it seems to me altogether an address to the prejudices of the clergy."

Thus far, there seems to have been no appeal to the doctrines of *epikeia* or *cy pres*. The decision stood by the expressed terms of the will. Indeed, it went apparently a little farther than the expressed terms and included in its scope the "*limitation* of the instruction" to pure morality, etc., although Girard had not so specified. He indeed alleged as a reason for excluding clergymen and ministers of any sort, his desire to protect the tender minds of the orphans from clashing doctrines and sectarian controversy. Laymen, however, could propound exactly the same clashing doctrines as clergymen; and only by implication are they forbidden to do so by the phraseology of the will. Girard could have expressed his intent much more directly by excluding, together with clergymen, all doctrinal exposition from whatsoever source, but he did not so word his thought. Neither did he specify any limita-

tion of instruction, although it might not be an unfair inference so to interpret his desires. On the other hand, it would not appear to be an unfair inference that whilst excluding sectarian teaching from the official program of instruction, Girard did not intend to exclude private and unofficial instruction for such orphans as already had embraced, through the wish or act of their parents, a definite creed. The orphans, unable to protect themselves, must not be made the targets for impassioned appeals by ministers of widely varying sects—a reasonable thing, indeed, but a very different thing from private instruction by desired expositors of the creed of the parents. And such expositors could be laymen.

If Bishop England correctly divined Girard's intent to be antagonistic to revealed religion, his forecast of events was a shrewd one: "An effort will be made to have a semblance of religion and a semblance of fulfilment of the trust." Thus the *Course of Study* (Philadelphia, 1904) for the College includes as material for moral instruction *Stories from the Bible* (page 14) and *The Bible for Children* by Gilder (page 15). Within the grounds of the College there is a beautiful chapel of Gothic architecture, built of white marble, having stained glass windows, and looking like an ordinary Christian church. There "the officers and pupils attend worship daily," says the *Handbook of Girard College* (Philadelphia, 1900, page 30), "before the opening of the schools, and after their close. The exercises consist of singing, reading the Scriptures and prayer. On Sundays, religious instruction is given by lectures or addresses, delivered by the president of the college or some layman who may be invited, morning and afternoon in addition to the daily worship. In an address delivered by one of the directors the speaker quoted the words of Bishop Lightfoot as voicing the sentiment of the directors of the college: 'The holy season extends all the year round, the temple confined only by the limits of the habitable world, a priesthood co-extensive with the human race.'"

A writer in the *Philadelphia Record* (Philadelphia, 16 June, 1918) remarks that "by the irony of fate, Girard College, in its effort to disabuse the general public of the impression that the testator sought to set up an institution for the spread of unbelief, has made religious teaching a conspicuous part of its curriculum," but "strictly non-sectarian." When Dr. Herrick, the present

efficient president of the College, was inducted into office in 1910, the program of exercises included "Reading of the Scriptures." In the Report for 1910 we find under the heading "Christmas Day" that "Religious Services" were conducted by President Herrick. It will be interesting to quote from his *Report* to the Board of Directors for the year 1910:

> Whatever were the motives of the Founder, the facts remain that Girard College has not been prevented from being an institution for moral and religious education. In the famous case brought for the invalidating of the will it was held that clergymen were not a necessity for religious and moral teaching and not only this but the requirement for moral education not only permitted but would seem to imply the necessity for the Bible.
>
> As a matter of fact, the first book introduced into Girard College was the Bible, and the Bible and religious worship have had a foremost place in the life of the institution from its foundation. The Honorable Joel Jones, first President, was a ruling elder of the Presbyterian Church. The revered President, William H. Allen, was a distinguished scholar and lay preacher of the Methodist Episcopal Church, having come to Girard College from Dickinson College. President Fetterolf is a vestryman of the Protestant Episcopal Church and a man of deeply religious instincts and of purity of life and high moral purpose.
>
> The prohibition of the admission of clergymen has laid upon laymen a sense of obligation for religious instruction in Girard College that has brought to the service of the College a deep consecration and a high order of talent. No one can attend our chapel exercises, either on Sunday or weekday, and not be convinced that they are impressive and forceful as religious services, and the testimony of Girard College boys, many of whom have identified themselves with churches while they are still in attendance, others of whom have gone out to active work in the church when they leave the College, all is in confirmation of the statement that Girard College is in the truest sense of the word an institution for religious and moral education.

Webster argued, in his great pleading before the Supreme Court of the United States, that when Girard declared in his will that he desired "the purest principles of morality" to be instilled into the minds of the orphans he was in effect following the specious wording of Paine's *Age of Reason:* "The same phraseology," said Webster, "in effect is here. Paine disguised his real meaning, it is true. He said: 'Let us devise means to establish schools to propagate morality, unfettered by *superstition.*'" And Webster implied that in the mind of Girard superstition and

religion were equivalents. If this be correct, Bishop England's *epikeia* or *cy pres* was a shrewd guess.

If Girard had planned an institution which should unerringly graduate infidels, he did not, in President Herrick's opinion, succeed. His will may have implied that the "orphans" should not receive dogmatic instruction within the walls that were to surround his College, but it did not specifically exclude such instruction elsewhere. The applicants should be between six and ten years of age, and might be retained as pupils until they should reach the age of eighteen. Some little grounding in religion might be supposed in children before entering, and some opportunities for further instruction are afforded by the occasional vacations of the children spent with their mothers or friends. In this connection it may be appropriate to consider what John M. Campbell tells us in the biographical sketch of his father, Judge James Campbell, contributed to the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* (V. 290):

> As far back as the year 1848 he had been made a Director of St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum, the oldest Catholic institution of its kind in the country . . . He left it when death called him [1893], the most prosperous of its kind in the United States . . . He was also one of the original members of the Board of Directors of Girard College, and for twenty-one years before his death, he served as Chairman of the Committee of Instruction. The same care was taken of Stephen Girard's splendid charity . . . He gave particular attention to the religious training of every Catholic boy in Girard College. He saw to it that they were permitted to go to instructions in their religion, and when he made his regular weekly visit to the College, inquired of each Catholic boy if he had been allowed to attend to his religious duties.

Judge Campbell was in the twentieth year of his age when Girard died, and doubtless shared the intense interest excited by the famous will. His legal mind later saw no difficulty in harmonizing the terms of the will with an insistence on some regular religious instruction for Catholic orphans. Doubtless he would by no means recommend such an institution for Catholic orphans, but meanwhile would exert every effort to ameliorate the religious lot of such children as found themselves, by no fault of their own, interned in the College. We may perhaps fairly surmise that he did not share the strong views of Daniel Webster.

Nor does Dr. Herrick share those views in his practical and

conscientious administration of the College. In a letter to me (29 June, 1918) he goes into large detail which should prove of greatest interest to Catholics. He says, *inter alia:*

1. The number of Catholic boys in the College continues at about 200. Careful note is taken of the religious faith of the families of boys when they are received into the Institution and the greatest respect is shown for this faith and every opportunity afforded for the boys to be instructed in the faith of their mothers, but only with the mother's permission and on her request.

2. The boys are permitted to spend the Sunday nearest Christmas Day and Easter Sunday with their mothers so that they may attend the services of their church. In addition, they are permitted to spend several weeks in the summer with their mothers if there are suitable home conditions for them so to do.

Over and above this, we respect the requests of mothers for boys to go for special services in their churches, to partake the holy communion and otherwise conform to the practices of their respective denominations.

When boys reach the age of about 11 years we respect the requests of their mothers for them to receive religious instruction in the church of their faith. For many years it has been the custom of the College to have a class of the Catholic boys go to the Church of the Gesu for instruction. Such a class has been continued in the present year and recently the boys have been confirmed in the church and have partaken of their first communion.

As you are well aware, the terms of the Girard Will forbade the receiving into the College of any ordained ecclesiastic. This has placed upon laymen the necessity for religious instruction in the College and we have called upon the most prominent laymen of all faiths and sects to speak in our Chapel service, and all is done with the fullest respect to everybody's faith, but without reference to any particular faith. In the list of Chapel speakers for many years was the Hon. Walter George Smith, who gave helpful and uplifting counsel to all the boys in the Institution. More recently we have had the services of the Hon. J. Washington Logue, and more recently still, we have all been edified and deeply impressed by the addresses delivered here by the Hon. Michael J. Ryan. Mr. Ryan spoke in our Chapel service on Sunday last. I can assure you his message was one which would have done credit to any pulpit.

In very brief, our situation appears to be that of an Institution that has religious instruction without denominations and in which, as is true in many private schools, the denominational preferences and expressed wishes of the mothers and families of the boys are fully respected . . .

No doubt we are carrying out the general plan of procedure made by the venerated father of John M. Campbell, certainly there never has been either in the conception of the College or in the carrying out of its policies any effort to make the situation either anti-religious or non-religious.

VII

In conclusion, we may return to questions of purely historical interest. There is no reason for doubting Webster's sincerity. His view in 1844 was but an echo of the views of those believers in revealed religion who in 1832 had filled the air with their criticisms of Girard. But the question returns again and again: What was Girard's real intent? One niece informs Father Hughes that it was anti-Christian, purely materialistic. On the other hand, we find a declaration in a curious pamphlet entitled *Refutation of a False, Cruel and Gross Libel*, etc. (Philadelphia, 1865), written by nieces of Girard, that they knew "our uncle's adhesion to the Roman Catholic Church" and had offered this as a reason why he should be buried in Holy Trinity graveyard. Finally, we have the legend narrated by Mahony in his *Historical Sketches of the Catholic Churches and Institutions of Philadelphia* (page 44) that Girard was asked on his death-bed if he would have a priest visit him, that he replied in the affirmative, but that he died before the priest arrived.

With respect to this third strand in the tangled web of interpretation, it should be said that while Simpson's account of the last moments of Girard would make it entirely a possible occurrence, Bishop Kenrick's note in his *Diary* renders it highly improbable. The legend has nevertheless persisted to the present time, and doubtless formed the basis for an interestingly written story which, curiously enough, appeared in *The Messenger of the Sacred Heart* about the time (in the May issue, 1918), that the *Life* was issuing from the press of the Lippincott Company. The story is entitled "The Sin of Simon Gold." One needs to read but a few lines to discover that the initials of Simon Gold apply to Stephen Girard, and that the Sin was the bequest for his College. Just before expiring, Simon Gold cries out—"My will! I don't mean it. I change——" but death summons him. The Judge is merciful, however. The Sin is indeed forgiven, but the temporal punishment for it is banishment from God's presence for eighty-one years and the vision of what his College then was. The ghost wanders through the grounds and buildings of the College and finally comes to a room where a Catholic boy is dying. The poor lad is crying piteously for a priest, but of course none may enter

the College, and the imploring look on the boy's face changes to that of a trapped animal, and finally to a still sadder one as with an awful cry his soul passes forth to judgment. The ghost of Simon Gold then visits the chapel of the College and there hears "cruel words of praise and honor" that sting him "like avenging rods." The writer, Neil Boyton, S. J., gives us, I think, a faithful picture of the prevailing attitude of Catholics towards the College. He is gentle, nevertheless, towards Girard.

We also may feel like passing a gentle judgment upon Girard, but for reasons other than the legend of his deathbed and the summoned priest. For the early education of Girard was scanty. He was but fourteen years old when he adopted a seafaring life. He roamed much, settling down at length in the non-Catholic community of Philadelphia. His reading would naturally be in the French language, and its most popular works were those of infidels. Nevertheless he still clung, however feebly, to the religion of his fathers. In view of his opinionated character, it may be that he did not realize the full meaning of his exclusion of clergymen from his College. He should indeed have surmised the folly of postponing religious training to a "matured reason" in the life of the orphans. But the surmise could easily have been a faint one to a man who had been but poorly grounded in his own Catholic beliefs as a boy. If we add to this his lifelong affliction of blindness in his right eye, his unfortunate marriage to a woman who became insane and remained thus for twenty-five years, his view of the Hoganite schism and the other disturbed conditions of Catholicity in Philadelphia, his concentration upon commerce and banking, his deafness in later life and the gradual dimming of vision in his left eye, the attack of erysipelas of which Simpson tells us and the accident which occurred in the penultimate year of his life, we may find it easy to pass a lenient judgment on the religious aberrations of Stephen Girard.

RIGHT REV. HUGH T. HENRY (LITT.D.),
Overbrook, Pa.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN BRITISH HONDURAS
(1851–1918)

No complete history of the church in British Honduras has yet been written. A short sketch, giving the main outlines of the interesting story of Catholic growth and progress in this British possession of Central America, from the coming of the missionaries down to 1893, was written and published by the present writer. Unfortunately only one copy is left; only fifty having been printed. This sketch, which has been used in the present article, was based upon documents left by Bishop di Pietro and upon material gathered in Honduras and elsewhere.

British Honduras is the only English dependency in Central America. It is bounded on the North by the Rio Hondo, which divides it from Yucatan; on the South by the River Sarstoon, which separates it from Guatemala; on the East by the Caribbean Sea, and on the West by the frontier which extends from the Rapids of Gracias-a-Dios on the Sarstoon through Garbutt's Falls on the Belize River, and thence due North to the Mexican border.

Belize, the capital of the Colony, was first settled by a group of English wood-cutters in 1662. Scattered as they were through the forests, these early colonists had little thought of building churches. They were almost all Protestants. It was only in 1812, when the city of Belize had been regularly laid out, that an Anglican Church was erected at government expense. In the year 1822, the Baptist Church was built; the Methodist Church in 1825; and in 1850, the Presbyterian Church. There were then very few Catholics in Belize; but in Mullens River, a village a few miles south of Belize, there was a small settlement of Catholic refugees from Spanish Honduras. These were ministered to by a Franciscan, Fray Antonio, who came there in 1832.

The little group of Catholics living in Belize had no church, no school and no permanent resident priest until 1851. In that year, the Very Reverend Benito Fernández, O. S. F., Vicar-Apostolic of Jamaica, sent two Jesuits, Fathers Dupont and Dupeyron, to take spiritual charge of the Catholic congregation.

The special need for their coming arose from events which had taken place some three years before in Yucatan. Exasperated by the misgovernment of their Spanish masters, the Indian popula-

tion had arisen in revolt, and with ruthless barbarity had massacred the greater number of the Spanish inhabitants of Bacalar and the adjoining district. Those who escaped became refugees on our northern frontier, where the main body eventually settled, and where they opened up what had hitherto been an uninhabited wilderness—save for the axe of the wood-cutter—into a number of flourishing ranchos and pueblos. Others again went farther into the interior of the colony, or domiciled themselves in Belize.

This new population was entirely Catholic; and it was on the representation of their need of pastors, that priests were sent from Jamaica to help them. In 1853, Father George Avvaro, S. J., came; he remained until the appointment of Father Salvatore di Pietro in 1872. Every two or three years, missioners came to add to the number of the clergy or to supply the place of those who had died or had left the colony. Churches and schools were built. Residences were established in eight new centres, and small chapels, sixty in number, were built wherever a few Catholic families could be gathered together. Seventy years ago the Catholic Church was almost non-existent or unknown, but at the present time Catholics form three-fifths of the population, or about 25,000. They live chiefly in the northern part of the Vicariate and are mostly descendants of the Spanish settlers from Yucatan. In the south the Caribs live in the seaside towns of Punta Gorda, Seine Bight and Stann Creek, and in the interior there is a large proportion of native Indians whose families emigrated from Guatemala in order to settle in British Honduras.

The Vicariate has not only grown in numbers, but in efficiency and in ecclesiastical formation; it has gradually evolved from a struggling dependent church into a compact diocese. Until 1888, it was subject to the jurisdiction of the Vicars-Apostolic of Jamaica, who from time to time, visited this distant part of their Vicariate; but the difficulties of communication with Jamaica were so great that a decree of Propaganda, dated June 16th, 1888 (analogous to that of 1884, by which British Honduras was declared an independent Crown Colony), separated Honduras from the Jamaica Vicariate. The Superior of the Mission, Father di Pietro, a Sicilian Jesuit, was appointed Prefect-Apostolic. While gratefully acknowledging this favor, the leading Catholics of the colony asked His Holiness, Pope Leo XIII, on the occasion of his Epis-

copal Jubilee, to give them the further boon of having a bishop. Their request was granted, the priest of their choice was nominated Vicar-Apostolic of British Honduras and Bishop of Eurea, January 14, 1893, and on April 16 in the same year, the Right Rev. Salvatore di Pietro, S. J., was consecrated in Belize by the Right Rev. Bishop Becker of Savannah, assisted by the Bishops of Natchez and Mobile.

Much of the progress in the Mission both spiritual and temporal was due to Father di Pietro, and now that he had been made bishop, he increased his efforts for the good of his people. During the five years of his episcopate, he made annual visits to the residences and to the stations, preaching and confirming, besides collecting money to pay off the debts incurred by building churches and schools. In 1898, he twice essayed to make his customary visitations of the north of the Vicariate, but each time, he was forced to return to Belize owing to serious attacks of heart trouble. On August 6, 1898, his feast day, a deputation of gentlemen came to congratulate him; the next morning, he asked to receive Holy Communion and to be anointed. Then began a long agony lasting nearly two weeks; he died on August 23. His funeral was largely attended by Catholics and non-Catholics alike. With the permission of the Government, he was buried in the Cathedral. In Bishop di Pietro's last testament, he named as Pro-Vicar the Rev. Frederick Hopkins, S. J., to take charge of the Vicariate at his death until news of an appointment should come from Rome. The Cardinal Prefect of the Propaganda confirmed the nomination, and gave the necessary episcopal faculties during the vacancy. On August 17, 1899, Father Hopkins was named by the Holy See, Vicar-Apostolic of British Honduras and titular Bishop of Athribis. He was consecrated in St. Louis, Missouri, November 5, 1899.

In December 1893, the Honduras Mission, which from the beginning had been attached to the English Province of the Society of Jesus, was transferred to the Fathers of the Missouri Province, who gradually replaced those from England. In April, 1899, Father William Wallace, S. J., was appointed Regular Superior and Pro-Vicar of the Bishop. He was followed by Father William Mitchell, S. J., in January, 1910, and in May, 1918, by Father John Neenan, S. J.

The progress of the Mission had had many checks and reverses in its formation. It had been established only a year, when in 1854, there came to Belize an epidemic of cholera, which in three months carried off a large number of Catholics, chiefly Italians, who had lately settled in the town. The zeal and edifying conduct of the priests in this calamity won for them universal respect and sympathy. This same year, Father Bertolio was sent to Corozal to open a second residence, but through the machinations of some excommunicated priests who had come from Yucatan, the missioner was forced to return to Belize. Later, repenting of their treatment of the priest who had been sent to them, the people of Corozal asked that another missioner might be allowed to come and dwell with them. Father Rossini went in 1858, but died after a year and a half, worn out by the many difficult journeys he had to endure. It was not until 1861, that the second residence of the Mission was established by Father Parchi. The troubles of Corozal were not yet over. An apostate Spaniard, turned Wesleyan, did much harm to souls by his preaching and distributing false Bibles and tracts. Knowing well the language of the Yucatecans and gifted with native eloquence, he deceived the simple people and led many to accept his teaching. The schism lasted for two years, but in the end the greater number came back, repentant to faith.

In July, 1856, the Mission in Belize met with a great reverse. Fire destroyed the northern end of the city of Belize, and the Fathers remained for nearly two years without residence, church, or school. A third residence, though hardly worthy of the name, was begun by Father Genon, S. J., in 1862, in Punta Gorda. This esteemed Belgian Father had the idea of uniting the widely scattered Carib population of the coasts of Spanish Honduras, Guatemala and British Honduras into one separate Mission, which should have its head-quarters in Punta Gorda. To forward this work he went to Belgium, put the matter before his countrymen, and came back with a small group of missioners—three priests, a schoolmaster and a gardener. After a few months in Punta Gorda, one of the Fathers died, two returned to Belize, the gardener returned to Belgium. So ended the special mission for the Caribs; and when Father Joseph Woollett, S. J., Pro-Vicar-Apostolic of Jamaica, came to visit the Mission in 1871, the residence

of Punta Gorda was ordered closed on account of the extreme poverty of the congregation.

In 1862, Rev. Eugene Biffi, an Italian secular priest, (later Bishop of Carthagena), passed through Belize and seeing the difficulties the Fathers had in carrying on the Mission, offered himself as a helper. During the five years he spent in the Colony, he learnt the Maya (Indian) language, which gave him a great ascendancy over the Icaiche Indians. When these same Indians organized a raid into the Colony, he was sent by the Government to make a friendly settlement with them. To this priest and to Father Brindisi, we owe the beginning of a residence and church at Stann Creek, which were fully established in 1867.

In 1873, Father Avvaro, S.J., the first Superior of the Mission, died at Corozal. The people of Belize clamoured to have his remains brought to the capital, and permission was given to disinter the body and bring it to the city. On its arrival, the body was deposited in the church, and on the following day, there was a solemn Requiem Mass. In the funeral procession to the cemetery, the hearse was followed by the governor and by the chief citizens of the town, all wearing mourning to show their esteem and love for the deceased priest. After a few months, a handsome mortuary monument was raised to his memory at the cost of the inhabitants of Belize.

In 1874, Father John Pittar, the first English Superior of the Mission, came to British Honduras. His presence and the coming soon afterwards of other English Fathers, dispelled the foolish idea which some of the colonists held, that there were no English Catholic priests. Hence arose a custom of calling the Catholic Church, the *Spanish* Church. This year, however, was not without its reverses for the Mission. Father Antonio Ayerve had built a church at San Estevan and on the eve of Palm Sunday, when everything was ready for the opening, a fire broke out in a house adjacent to the church and in a few hours the building was entirely destroyed. Thus the good Father was left without a church and without resources. He was therefore obliged to return to the central residence at Corozal, where he died in June, 1874. Scarcely two months had passed, when yellow fever carried off two other Fathers in the same house. The new Superior, Father Pittar, recognized the sore straits in which the Fathers

were, and the need of funds to establish the Mission on a more solid basis. His appeals met with a generous response, and with the alms sent him, he was able to build a church and a house at Orange Walk. This new residence was placed under the charge of the indefatigable Father Parisi. Father Pittar likewise reopened the Residence of Punta Gorda and built there a more commodious church, which was again put under the care of Father Genon, who continued his labours among the Caribs until his death in 1878.

One of the great difficulties the Mission had to contend with, was to provide efficient teachers for its parochial schools. Belize Catholic school secured a good teacher in Brother Mark Quin, who came to the Mission in 1869, and continued to be its schoolmaster until his death in 1879. His work was continued by his brother Richard. Meanwhile the school in Corozal, for want of an efficient master, had made but little progress, and many Catholic children had gone to the Methodist school, wherein some of them lost their faith. The coming of Father Henry Gillet in 1876, stopped this leakage, and so saved the Catholic youth of Corozal from a situation which might have been detrimental to their religion. Five residences had now been established under the care of eight Fathers: three in Belize, two in Corozal, and one in each of the residences of Orange Walk, Stann Creek and Punta Gorda.

A Catholic Association was formed in 1879, the chief purpose of which was to promote Catholic interests in the Mission. The principal gentlemen of the town of Belize became members and Mr. Henry Fowler, the Colonial Secretary, was chosen president.

With the coming of the new missioners, the Mission flourished until 1881. A singular event took place that year, which caused some anxiety for a time. Father Henry Gillet, who had been teaching in the parochial school at Stann Creek, took advantage of the Easter vacation to pay a visit to the Izabal Lagoon. He had scarcely landed at Livingstone, when the telegraph notified Señor Rufino Barrios, President of Guatemala, of the arrival of the Jesuit Father, and asked for instructions. The next day, the priest was arrested and was taken under escort to Guatemala City, a journey of five days. As soon as he arrived, he was put into a dungeon used for those condemned to death, and

after two days without food, he was subjected to a strict interrogatory. Although the officials could find nothing against him he was transferred to the public prison of criminals, where he remained ten days, until he found the opportunity to communicate with the English Consul at Guatemala. The Consul sent his secretary to look into the case, and when he learnt what had taken place, he went in person to the president and asked for the priest's immediate release. On the following day Father Gillet was set at liberty, and conducted back to Izabal. Thence he returned to Belize.

One of the great difficulties in the way of spiritual progress in the Mission, is the language question. About three-fourths of the Catholic population are Spanish or Indian-speaking. Outside Belize and the two residences in the south, the language of the school is English and the language of the Church is Spanish, while the language of the home is either Spanish or Maya. The children in the school read English, though many do not understand it, but out of school, they speak another tongue. The missioners, except two, are all English-speaking, so that they have to acquire two and sometimes three languages before they can be of efficient service in missionary work.

It was felt that the arrangement of having the Fathers teach in the elementary schools interfered seriously with other parish work. For many years the Superiors of the Mission had thought of sending for Sisters to undertake the education of the girls, but for want of money they could not carry out the wishes of the people of Belize. At last, however, Father di Pietro visited Europe to seek for missioners and to collect money for the various works of the Mission. There he met the Reverend Mother of the Sisters of Mercy in New Orleans, and arranged with her to send, on his return to Belize, six Sisters of Mercy to teach the Belize schools. They came on January 20, 1883, and since that time they have worked faithfully and successfully, both in their Academy and in the Catholic Public Schools of Belize. The Belize Convent of Mercy received its subjects from the Mother-House in New Orleans. In August, 1900, the Sisters of Mercy opened another convent in Corozal; but after a year and a half this had to be closed, because the Mother-House was unable to send sufficient teachers for two convents. This same lack of subjects threat-

ened later the closure of the Belize Convent, but, on representation to the Holy See, this difficulty was overcome. Still no new teachers could be sent for the schools, and so in the course of time, it looked as though the convent would cease to exist. Under such circumstances, it was decided to make the Belize Convent an independent foundation. In 1914, those of the Sisters who elected to return to the Mother-House left for New Orleans, while the rest remained to carry on the work of teaching some five hundred children, with the assistance of postulants, who had come in answer to an advertisement in the *Messenger of the Sacred Heart*. Many applied; some came, some left; and with those who stayed there is now a Community of fifteen, two of whom are Lay Sisters.

At another residence, that of Orange Walk, a convent of the Sisters of the Third Order of Mount Carmel was begun. It lasted for about two years, but had to be closed on account of sickness among the Sisters. Nor was this the only misfortune which befell the Orange Walk Mission. At great personal sacrifice, giving much of their labor gratuitously, the people of the place had built a large church at the cost of five thousand dollars. In November, 1899, it was completely destroyed by fire, through the carelessness of an altar boy in the sacristy. This misfortune almost broke the heart of the Pastor, Father Piemonte, through whose exertions chiefly the church had been built. To console him, the people at once came forward and offered their labor and money to build a new stone church. In 1898, the Sisters of the Holy Family (colored) came to the Mission. They were put in charge of the Stann Creek Catholic School, where they still continue to do splendid work among the Carib population, both in school and parish.

Through the kindness of a benefactress, we were enabled to build a convent at Benque Viejo for four Sisters of the Congregation of Pious Missions. Since 1912, they have had charge of an Indian school, which has grown so steadily under their fostering care that we have had to build a much larger school to accommodate the school children. They have a roll of over two hundred pupils. Three more Sisters of the same Congregation are, since 1913, teaching a school with great success in Corozal. Thus has been solved the problems of procuring efficient teachers for our larger elementary schools.

Meanwhile, whilst we had been providing for our primary schools, there had been growing up among our people, and among good Catholics in the neighbouring republics, a desire to see established in Belize a school for boys and girls, giving a higher education. For this reason were founded in Belize: St. Catherine's Academy, which has now about one hundred and thirty pupils, twenty-five being boarders, and St. John's College, conducted by Jesuit Fathers. In 1917, the College registered one hundred and seventy-six students, of whom one hundred and five were boarders.

Both Academy and College began in a very humble way. A select school was started in the Belize presbytery with Father Cassian Gillet as the teacher. There were two boarders and twelve day-scholars. After a time the boarding school had to be given up, but the select day-school continued with varying fortune until 1895. Then, with fifty boys on the roll, a small building was begun at the back of the presbytery to accommodate the increasing numbers of students. The foundation-stone was laid by His Excellency, E. B. Sweet-Escott, C. M. G., the Acting Governor, and it was formally opened February 3, 1896. So began St. John Berchmans' College. It continued to grow and boarders from the republics of Central America came in such numbers that a new building to accommodate them had to be erected.

A site, fronting on the ocean, of twenty-five acres, was purchased from the Government, as the place for the new St. John's. There a handsome college has been built at an outlay of nearly one hundred thousand dollars. The main building is 262 feet long by 70 feet wide, the well-equipped gymnasium is 80 by 40 feet, whilst to the right of the main college building is the Fusz Memorial Chapel, attached to which is a spacious dining-room. The College more than meets the requirements of the Catholic youth of the colony; but the object in building it was likewise to give parents of the neighbouring republics the means of obtaining for their sons a solid intellectual and moral training without having to send them too far abroad. This object has to a great extent been realized, and the great body of students come from Guatemala, Honduras, San Salvador and Nicaragua, and a few from Mexico. These youths are being instructed and well founded in secular and religious knowledge, and it is confidently

hoped that, after their college course, they will exercise a beneficial influence in their respective countries.

Thus has this Mission of British Honduras grown in buildings, in numbers and in efficiency. But with the means to work, the fruit of the labors of the Missioners has, by God's grace, likewise increased.

The Vicariate of British Honduras is at present (1918) constituted as follows: there is one bishop, nineteen priests, four scholastics and four lay-brothers. All the priests are members of the Society of Jesus, except one. There are nine residences and over sixty outside stations. There is one college, one academy and thirty-six Catholic Public Schools. They are called Public Schools, because they accept the government standards for the lay branches of instruction, submit to inspection in these branches by the Inspector of Schools, and receive government grants-in-aid. There are four convents of religious women, all of whom teach in our elementary schools. The Sisters of Mercy came to Belize in 1883, the Sisters of the Holy Family to Stann Creek in 1898, the Sisters of the Pious Missions to Benque Viejo in 1912 and to Corozal in 1913.

Nor has the spiritual fruit of the work of the Missioners been behindhand. In the beginning of the Mission the few Fathers had to be content with baptizing, marrying and giving the sacraments without much instruction. There were no regular catechetical instructions, no properly constituted sodalities, and few Catholic schools. Comparing the work of the priests of 1882 with that of 1916, we see a marked progress. There were in 1882, nine priests, two lay-brothers, four residences, thirty-five stations, ten schools, eight hundred pupils, five hundred and forty-seven baptisms and seven converts. There are today thirty-six sodalities with one thousand six hundred and seventy-one members; the Apostleship of Prayer has five thousand one hundred and six associates, and there is now an estimated Catholic population of twenty-five thousand. The population of British Honduras has been of very slow growth, for there are no manufactories of any importance to attract laborers; and our young people, unless they become wood-cutters or Chicle bleeders, frequently leave to find work elsewhere.

The chief vices we have to contend with are drunkenness and

concubinage. These are difficult to eradicate. There is a constant influx of people from the neighboring republics. The people living near the borders of the colony and having no resident priests have grown up ignorant of their Catholic faith, and so readily fall into immorality. Their influence upon our native population is bad. As to the vice of drunkeness, hardly anything is done by the Government to put a stop to it, except the placing of a high duty on all alcoholic liquors.

As to the future of religion in British Honduras, the convents, with the religious as teachers in the schools, will have a salutary influence over women to make them respect the sanctity of marriage, and the sodalities with the increased frequentation of the sacraments will raise the moral tone among men. Still, with the present low standard of morality around them, there will be frequent lapses from virtue among the young, who begin well but oftentimes end badly.

The Vicariate is intimately connected with the Church of the United States inasmuch as it depends upon the Missouri Province of the Society of Jesus for its priests, while much of the progress made so far has been due to the unfailing generosity of charitable friends in North America.

✠ RIGHT REV. FREDERICK C. HOPKINS, S.J., D.D.,
Vicar-Apostolic of British Honduras,
Titular Bishop of Athribis,
Belize, British Honduras.

THE AGLÍPAY SCHISM IN THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

In a paper published in a recent issue of THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW, I said in speaking of the Aglípay Schism:

> The uncertain status of the religious life in the islands is well exhibited by the Aglípay schism. This, however, had a political as well as religious side, which of course further complicated the matter. Gregorio Aglípay, a native of one of the Iloco provinces in the north of the Island of Luzon, and a duly ordained secular priest, had attained to considerable eminence under Archbishop Nozaleda during the closing years of the Spanish regime. During the revolution against Spain, which broke out in 1896, he pursued a somewhat devious course (the whole story of which is not yet fully known), in which he played off one side against the other with considerable astuteness. Shortly after the beginning of American control, Aglípay finally split with the ecclesiastical authorities, and largely through the influence of a fellow countryman, Isabelo de los Reyes, a layman of considerable force of character, though lacking in balance, headed a new church known as the Aglípay or Independent Filipino Church. An effort was made to give the new institution a national character, which caused the government to fear that, under cover of religion, the Filipinos were plotting a new revolt against American authority. The movement spread like wildfire at first. The majority of the masses and some of the upper-class people of the two Iloco provinces joined the schism, which also numbered followers in almost all the islands in which Christianity was professed. At one time Aglípay claimed over 3,000,000 adherents, but this was doubtless a gross exaggeration. In many places, however, whole congregations of the Roman Catholic Church went over to the new sect, and other congregations were violently split apart. The schismatics attempted to take possession of the churches and other church property, but they were compelled by law to return them to their former owner, the Roman Catholic Church. At the inception of the movement Aglípay and Reyes consulted the Protestants, especially the Methodists, who had gone to the Philippines shortly after the capture of Manila, and considerable advice was received from that quarter, as well as from the Episcopalians. But the movement soon grew beyond control, and Reyes by his dominating personality gave the new church a direction that it never would have taken under the sole tutelage of Aglípay. To Reyes, in fact, are due very largely the Constitution, the so-called Bible of the Independent Filipino Church, the Catechism, and other literature published under the auspices of the new organization, much of which is a curiously puerile mass of contradictory, plagiarized, and undigested material. In his efforts to depart as far as possible from the tenets of the old Church, Reyes obligated the Aglípay Church (on paper) to a course broader in many ways than that of the most radical Unitarian Church. In real practice, however, the ceremonies of the schismatic church, except possibly in one or two instances, have never deviated in any essential from those of the Catholic Church, and the same Mass may be heard today in both churches. The Catholic Church has maintained on the whole, aside from its effort to

regain possession of its property, a laissez-faire policy in regard to the schismatic church, and it is possibly partly due to this fact that the movement has greatly died out with the return of many of its adherents to the bosom of Mother Church. But it can not be denied that the schism was a matter of deep concern to the Church, for Archbishop Harty, until quite recently the head of the Manila Diocese and of the Church in the Philippines, remarked to the writer in 1910 that it was only the Providence of God that had saved the Catholic faith in the Philippine Islands.

It might be of interest to give the story of the schism in greater detail, for in it are involved many questions of importance in the Philippine Islands, and it touches broad principles at many angles. Warning must be given at the outset, however, that final judgment can not be yet pronounced in every particular because of lack of definite information to fill in certain gaps. Events are still too recent to be known in their entirety, and the whole cannot be seen with sufficient clearness to enable one to make those broad generalizations which the historian coming after a score of years may be able to make.

The roots of the schism are not hard to find. They were in part of long standing and in part of very recent growth.[1] On the one hand are involved various religio-political questions,[2] and on the other, the entrance of modern ideas into the Philippines and the growth of the feeling of nationality among the Filipinos. Little can here be said of these matters as they would lead too far afield, but some general consideration must be given to them. In them is comprehended the whole friar question which was debated with avidity pro and con during the closing years of Spanish sovereignty both by Spanish and Filipino writers, and which no less has often been discussed since 1898 in our own press.

The friar question grew up almost unconsciously, yet naturally. Spain's overseas colonies reproduced in their methods of governing very largely conditions already familiar in Spain. State and Church were one and indivisible, and every ecclesiastical person, by reason of this close union, was an agent of the govern-

[1] Aglipay (*Independent*, October 29, 1903), claimed that the Independent Church was already thirty years old, but this can not be substantiated. He referred, of course, to the execution of the three Filipino priests after the suppression of the incipient insurrection of 1872. This event, however, did in a measure prepare the way for the revolt from the Church.

[2] Rev. Ambrose Coleman, O.P., writing in *The American Catholic Quarterly Review* (April, 1905, pp. 368–381), says that the Aglipay movement was political instead of religious. Had he said that it was a combination of the religious and the political, he would have been more nearly correct.

ment. This had both strength and weakness—strength, as it allowed a consolidation of interests especially in the opening years of colonization; weakness, because it was bound in time to cause an intense internal upheaval.

In the Philippines, the Spanish Crown, enjoying the royal patronage,[3] with its privileges and obligations, set about the conversion of the natives with right good will; and it can never be charged against Spain that it was faithless to the papal injunctions given in the year following Columbus's departure on his quest of discovery. In order to meet its obligations to evangelize newly discovered and occupied territory, the Crown, upon colonizing the Philippines, made use of the most readily accessible means, and this happened to be the friar organizations which already had the machinery for such an undertaking, but the intention was announced of replacing the friars as soon as possible by secular clergy. Thus the friar question came into existence.

The religious corporations, with their powerful organizations, were able to root themselves firmly in the soil and to exercise a not inconsiderable influence in public life, both governmental and social. Indeed, they became the center about which all native life revolved. Attempts to secularize the parishes in accordance with the oft-expressed injunctions of the Spanish Crown failed repeatedly, both because of the lack of a secular clergy, either Spanish or Filipino, and because of the opposition of the regular clergy, and it was not until the latter part of the nineteenth century that secularization obtained even a halting start. To the end of the Spanish regime, the religious corporations exercised by far the greatest influence in the Philippines.

This influence came in time, however, to be exerted for the orders themselves, rather than for the Filipinos under their charge or for the direct interests of Spain, and the struggle of the friars became one for the preservation of power. It has often been said with considerable truth that Spain had an army in

[3] By special agreement, the Spanish Crown defrayed the expenses of religion in the Philippines, as in the American colonies, in return for which it was allowed to make ecclesiastical appointments. For this reason tithes were not collected in the Philippines. The possession of this power led on more than one occasion to a clash of interests between the civil and the ecclesiastical governments. On the transfer of the Philippines to the United States, it was argued that this power became inherent in the Government of this country—a ridiculous assumption.

every friar in the Philippines. The work of the friars can scarcely be measured, and it extended in many directions. Ambition, both corporative and personal, urged the friars forward, but after they had become firmly established in the land, that ambition too often took on a material tinge from which the purely religious suffered grievously—a by no means unnatural fault for any body of men to fall into, and especially men situated as were the friars in the Philippines. Accordingly they are found doing the very things that they condemned in others. Coming in time to look upon the Philippines as peculiarly their own, they resented any interference from outside their own ranks, whether from the secular clergy or from the government. Hostile to change in the *statu quo*, they became a bar to progress and the Philippines lagged lamentably behind the rest of the world.

It must not be thought that the friars were the only cause for the backwardness of the Philippines. The civil government must shoulder its part of the blame; but it is true that had the friars desired they could have changed the conditions, as they had the greatest power in the archipelago, and almost to the end of the Spanish regime, any movement headed by them was sure of success. The progress which they failed to sanction and introduce came into the islands in spite of them and the upheaval when it came centered about them.

They failed in two very essential matters: the building up of a responsible body of Filipino clergy[4] who could take over the parishes and thus ensure the loyalty of Filipinos to the Church and to Spain; and in guiding reforms forced through the entrance of modern ideas which came in spite of friar protest. By neglecting to satisfy the natural feeling of a people who felt that they had been unjustly treated, or to guide an ever-increasing popular

[4] The *Catholic World* of March, 1903 (lxxvi, 851, 852), commenting on the letter to the Philippines from Pope Leo XIII in 1902, says:

"It is Rome's purpose, and it has always been the traditional policy of Rome, to insist on the cultivation of a native clergy. Over and over again has the Propaganda insisted on the open-door policy for the native priests to even the highest responsibilities. There never has been any race which as a race has been debarred from the priesthood or even the hierarchy. If any people has been called to the Catholic Church it has also been called to the responsibilities and dignities of the clerical state.

"In the history of the Catholic missions this policy has not always been followed by some of the missionaries. An oligarchic form of spiritual government has been instituted and the native has been kept in tutelage.

. . . . . .

"Hereafter in the Philippines the native clergy must be given opportunity to advance themselves in learning and in sanctity, and consequently in places of dignity and responsibility in the Church."

demand, they failed deplorably, and they were bound to be the victims of their own failures. Because their own growth had ceased, they endeavored to stifle growth in others, failing to see that by their lack of prudence and foresight they were endangering not only their own future but the future of Spain in the Philippines. They should have learned after their long years of tutelage of the Filipinos that those people are among the easiest to guide but the most difficult to drive. By attempting the latter, they roused against themselves forces that, joined with other reasons, in the end brought about the revolt against Spain. As the government of Spain in the Philippines was constituted, the religious and the political were so closely intermingled that an attempt against one was necessarily an attempt against the other. Thus it came about that the revolt when it broke out was not unmixed but was waged against Spain, although with hate chiefly centered upon the friar. Hence the demands for the expulsion of the orders, with some assurance that Spain would yield to these demands. The Spanish-American war prevented any such move and the transfer of sovereignty found the friars still in the islands and another nation in control of the destinies of the Filipinos. Politics began to play a larger share in the widening horizon of the Filipinos, but hostility to the friars still overtopped all other sentiments, and the schismatic church—the creature of agitation, whose watchword was resentment against the friars and which formed a part of the expression of a national life, sprang into existence, after events that had long been preparing.

Gregorio Aglipay y Labayen, from whom the schism took its name, was born in the pueblo of Batac, in the province of Ilokos Norte, May 9, 1860.[5] His parents belonged to the peasant agricultural class, and were in moderate or even perhaps straitened circumstances. Until the age of sixteen, the young Gregorio attended the schools of his native village and aided his father with the work on the land, the chief crop of which was probably tobacco.[6] In that year, a drought prevented the setting out

[5] See Aglipay's own story in the *Independent* for October 29, 1903 (Vol. lv, pp. 2571–75). JOHN FOREMAN, *The Philippine Islands* (New York, Scribner's, 1906), and W. E. RETANA, *La Iglesia Filipina Independiente*, in *Por Esos Mundos*, April, 1908, give the date as May 7.

[6] The tobacco industry had been a government monopoly since 1781. At the beginning it had ushered in an era of considerable economic prosperity, but long before the period of which we are treating it had become an intolerable burden on the people, and was a constant source of extortion

of the number of tobacco plants required according to the regulations of the tobacco monopoly, and in consequence both Gregorio and his father were arrested.[7] On being released the former, partly due to this unpleasant experience and partly because his father had arranged for him a marriage not to his liking, went to Manila. There he supplemented his slender schooling with two years' study in a private school in the house of a Filipino lawyer, one Julian Carpio.[8] This was followed by a course in the Dominican school of San Juan de Letran[9] where he paid for his education and maintenance, in part at least, by working in the capacity of a servant. He proved an exceedingly apt pupil, and in due time was graduated in both philosophy and the arts, being regarded by his teachers with extreme favor both because of his application and his exemplary conduct. After graduation from the above institution, he entered the conciliar seminary in Bigan, in the province of Ilokos Sur, where he studied for the priesthood, and attained in time the sub-diaconate in the Diocese of Nueva Segovia.[10] In 1889, he was ordained in Manila, and sang his First Mass in the church of Santa Cruz, Manila, on New Year's Day, 1890.[11] Entering upon his active ministry, he served successively as assistant priest in the towns of Indang, San Antonio, and Victoria, situated respectively in the provinces of Cavite, Nueva Ecija, and Tarlac.[12]

When the Tagalog revolution of 1896 broke out against Spanish authority, he was stationed in the last-named town, but apparently took little or no active part in these early disturbances. So highly was he regarded in Manila, indeed, that, after the signing of the so-called pact of Biak-na-bató, by which Aguinaldo and other leaders agreed to abandon the movement, on condition of the payment of a certain sum of money by the Spanish government, to him was assigned the task of "attracting" to the government one Makabulos, who had refused to sign the pact.

and injustice. According to the government regulations by which the monopoly was controlled, each holder or owner of land was obliged to rear a certain number of plants each year and could dispose of his product only to the government at a stated price. The monopoly was finally suppressed in 1881.

[7] See FOREMAN, and RETANA, *ut supra*.

[8] *Ibid.* The opportunity to attend this school and to receive his later education seems to have come through a relative in Manila.

[9] Founded in 1626 by a layman and taken in charge by the Dominicans in 1640.

[10] Established as a suffragan bishopric by papal bull of 1595.

[11] See *Independent* and FOREMAN, *ut supra*.

[12] See FOREMAN, and RETANA, *ut supra*

The obstinate chieftain gave heed to Aglipay's representations and submitted to authority;[13] but Aglipay himself, either because of these very negotiations or because of other actions, fell under suspicion in certain quarters. Being warned by a fellow priest that he was about to be arrested because of his liberal tendencies, of which he is said to have been admonished previously by the friars,[14] he fled to Manila, where feigning illness, he was given asylum by the Canon of the Cathedral who had acted as his sponsor at the time of his ordination.[15]

Aglipay apparently lived quietly in Manila for some time, where he continued to hold the favor of the highest Spanish ecclesiastics and, probably through them, of the officials of the civil government as well. With the advent of the belligerent forces of the United States in Philippine waters the Filipino revolution which had never been completely suppressed, gathered new force. The Archbishop, Bernardino de Nozaleda, a Dominican, in fear lest all was lost as this new crisis appeared, sent Aglipay to carry his oft-quoted war pastoral to the Iloko provinces, in which he urged the natives to unite with the Spaniards in order by defensive warfare to repel the barbarous invader from their shores.[16] From this time and for several years, Agli-

[13] See RETANA, *ut supra*.

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] Foreman seems to be considerably confused as to Aglipay's movements after he left Victoria, and although Retana's account is not altogether satisfactory, for want of a better, I am forced to rely partly upon it.

[16] RETANA, *ut supra*. Probably the pastoral issued on May 6, 1898, and which was cited by Aglipay in a manifesto of March, 1899, when he portrayed the archbishop's former attitude toward the Americans with his attitude at the time of the manifesto. In it, Nozaleda said: "You must not remain ignorant of him (referring to the North Americans) who now appears before you with so much pride and who, trampling down all right, desires to impose his rule upon us. It is the foreigner who wants to subject us to his cruel yoke. It is the heretic who desires to destroy our religion and tear us from the bosom of the Catholic Church. It is the insatiable merchant who, in the midst of the ruin of Spain and her possessions, desires to swell his fortunes. . . . Poor Spain, if the invader succeeds in his designs! Poor Filipinos, the day upon which the North American establishes a stable government! Poor natives, subjugated by a people who have not the Catholic faith of Spain, nor the paternal anxiety for the good of the country, nor the high sense of honor, nor the community of interests, nor the history mingled with yours for now more than 300 years, nor the mingled blood which flows through the veins of many of you and which on a hundred glorious days has been poured out for the common defense! Brothers bound together by a common bond; sons of the metropolis and of the colonies! Very soon you will see an impassable abyss between you and your proud friends. You will have no offices nor employments, nor will you share at all in the government and the administration of the cities. You will form a class apart, you will be held vile as Pariahs, you will be exploited like convicts sent to work in a new country; you will be reduced to the condition of bondsmen and even beasts and machines; fed a handful of rice or corn which your lord will throw in your face as a daily ration so that you may not be utterly deprived of the product of your sweat, while you can enjoy the pleasure of seeing him revel in the fruits and treasures of an estate which was yours and now is his! Ah, that is not the worst. Soon you will see your temples ruined, or converted into Protestant chapels where the God of the Eucharist

pay's actions cannot be followed with anything like the definiteness desirable, but the evidence presented implies such a curious and well-managed system of duplicity that although one must condemn its author, he must admire the astuteness with which he worked. Just what were his relations with the Filipino insurgents and with the ecclesiastical hierarchy at Manila and elsewhere, it is still impossible to say. He seems for a while at least to have played off one side against the other with a skill that still baffles a complete unraveling, and it may be that the whole truth is known to no other person than to Aglípay himself.[17] Not the least wonder is that he should have been given so free a hand by both sides.

He was also commissioned by the civil authorities, or by the ecclesiastical authorities with the knowledge of the former, to go to the camp of the insurgents for the purpose of entering into

(oh, what a cruel misfortune) will not be enthroned, and where the image of the Virgin Mary, our most sweet and gentle mother, will not lean in kindly fashion over you. The cross will disappear from your cemeteries, the crucifix from your schools, and from your churches the ministers of the true God who made you Christians when they baptized you, and have so many times absolved you from your sins, who united you in holy matrimony, who will be present at your last hour to console and administer the last rites of the Church, and who, after your death, will apply for the good of your soul the prayers of the Holy Church. You, with your heroic faith and valor may go on keeping your hearts as Catholic as before, even more steadfast than before, who knows? But what will happen to your dear children, your darling sons, especially if their fathers fail them, in the midst of a Protestant nation, with Protestant legislation, rites, teachings, and habits, and a free exhibition and progapanda of every vice and error? Ah, what can one expect, but that at the end of half a century, there will be neither Christian practice or Christian belief anywhere in the whole country, nor any one who makes upon his forehead the sign of the cross. Poor Filipinos, lost in this life and lost in the eternal one!" See Report of Major-General E. S. Otis, September 1, 1899 to May 5, 1900, pp. 313–316, Part II of *Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year ended June* 30, 1900 (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1900).

Aglípay later used this pastoral with effect against the Archbishop whom he denounced in scathing terms as a turncoat and traitor who had "allied himself with the traitor Otis and the inhuman Dewey, giving them counsel and instruction and ordering his brothers, the friars, to pass praying in and through the walled city animating the enemies of our religion and country and praying to the God of battles in their behalf"; and of the friars he said: "Among these memories there is one which will always be a black spot upon our history. It is the memory of the enlightened corporations which came here to the misfortune of our most beautiful soil, not to teach us divine doctrines, but to exploit us and deprive us of our Catholic faith. The members of the above-mentioned corporations (as if God himself had interfered in events so that we should recognize them for what they are and that our eyes should be opened) not only have been wanting in all shame as to abjure their nation, but have also trampled under foot the sacred religion which they professed—a religion which served them as a shield against the consequences of their insolence. They went so far as to lick up, if you will permit the expression, the filth which they had vomited upon those who were their bitterest enemies and who are now their dearest friends"—that is the Americans. Otis, who cites this in the above report, says that "when Nozaleda summoned him to submit, he prepared and published articles severely condemning the Spanish representatives of the Roman Catholic Church and abusive of Americans, thus gaining considerable influence over that part of the population dominated by Aguinaldo." Of the manifesto, Otis declares that it exhibits Aglípay's "talent at invective."

[17] Aglípay's statements regarding his actions, as given in the *Independent* of October 29, 1903, are unsatisfactory, and until he chooses to speak more openly and at greater length, the entire truth will probably not be known.

negotiations with them for the Spaniards,[18] but the train in which he had started was captured at Bigáa in Bulacan province, and both he and some Spanish soldiers were taken into custody. Aglípay, however, was almost immediately released by order of the insurgent general of that district, and returned to Manila.

At this juncture, Aguinaldo returned to the Philippine Islands. He had known Aglípay well in Indang before the outbreak of the insurrection of 1896, and now seems to have lost no time in getting into touch with him again. As a result of this, Aglípay seems to have acted as a go-between for Nozaleda and Aguinaldo, accepting the confidences of both, giving neither his own complete confidence, but probably leaning more evenly and sincerely toward the insurgent side, and going and coming between Filipinos and Spaniards as he wished.[19] The results obtained on either side seem to be negligible, notwithstanding Nozaleda's appeal to the Filipinos through the forces of religion.

The Americans entered Manila as victors on August 13, 1898, and Aglípay who was out of the city at the time, found his entrance barred when he attempted to return. Thereupon he turned back to the insurgent camp, where he found a ready welcome. At the advice of Mabini, the "brains of the revolution", he was appointed military chaplain of the insurgent army, and finally by decree of Aguinaldo, October 28, 1898, he was appointed vicar-general of the whole archipelago.[20] On the fifteenth of the fol-

[18] See RETANA, *ut supra*.

[19] RETANA, *ut supra*, says that Aguinaldo sent one of his generals to confer secretly with Aglípay whom he asked to raise the provinces in the northern part of Luzon in favor of the insurgents and that Nozaleda, to whom Aglípay communicated the matter, advised acceptance, for with Aguinaldo's pass, Aglípay could have ready entrance to the insurgent camp and thus win over the Filipinos to the Spanish side; while Aguinaldo, to whom the Archbishop's advice was communicated, also counseled acceptance, for with the Archbishop's pass, Aglípay would have more opportunity to raise the northern provinces. Aglípay (*Manila Times*, January 1, 1903, and *Independent*, October 29, 1903) claimed that in the summer of 1898, the Spanish Governor-General and the Archbishop sent him to the insurgents in order to gain their coöperation against the Americans—probably the occasion upon which he carried the latter's pastoral letter. See JAMES A. LEROY, *The Americans in the Philippines* (New York, 1914), i, 318.

[20] Aglípay declared (*Manila Times* and *Independent*, *ut supra*), that Bishop Hevia Campomanes, of the Diocese of Nueva Segovia, who was held prisoner by the insurgents in the Kagayan Valley in 1898 and 1899, conferred upon him authority to perform the duties of a bishop in that Diocese, that his general authority over the native priests in the province when acting as "military chaplain" under Aguinaldo was recognized, and that he was used as an agent by Archbishop Nozaleda at Manila. Some negotiations between the Spanish Archbishop and the insurgent camp is evident as Aglípay was not excommunicated until the first quarter of 1899 notwithstanding his assumption of power. However, a decree of Aguinaldo of October 26, 1898, denied recognition of appointments to parishes made by

lowing month, he is said to have been appointed ecclesiastical governor of his Diocese by Bishop Hevia Campomanes, then held as a prisoner in the hands of the insurgents.[21] At any rate, whether he were legally appointed or not, Aglípay daily arrogated to himself greater authority over the native clergy.

Events in the political field added a new factor, or at least gave a changed direction to affairs in the Philippines. On December 10, 1898, was signed the Treaty of Paris, by which Spain yielded to the United States its sovereignty in the Archipelago. This instrument having once been signed, Spaniards in the Philippines, either lay or ecclesiastical, could no longer legally oppose the United States forces or policy. There was, therefore, no longer any reason for a rapprochement between the Spaniards and the revolted Filipinos. By the terms of the treaty, Spanish forces were immediately to be withdrawn from the Archipelago. Peninsular Spanish subjects might remain in the Philippines under the protection of the same laws as other foreigners. In case they chose to remain, they could preserve their allegiance to Spain by making declaration to that effect before a court of record within one year after the date of the exchange of ratifications of the treaty; but if no such declaration were made they were to be considered as having renounced their Spanish allegiance and to have adopted that of the Philippines. The one article of the treaty which touched upon religion was to be of immense import in the Philippines. It was a mere declaration that "The inhabitants of the territories over which Spain relinquishes or cedes her sovereignty shall be secured in the free exercise of their religion." The treaty was ratified by the Senate on February 6 by a majority of only two votes over the necessary two-thirds.[22]

Nozaleda, so that the understanding certainly did not carry very far, in benefits conferred at least. See LeRoy, *The Americans in the Philippines*, i, 318, 319.

After the Americans had entered Manila, and with relations between them and the Filipino army growing more strained daily, it would be very logical for the Spaniards to hope for coöperation from the Filipinos against the invaders; and, given the close connection between State and Church in the Philippines, it would be natural for the ecclesiastical officers to attempt to further such a policy. This policy did apparently lead Nozaleda to wink at infractions of Church discipline and for the sake of future gains connive with the insurgents up to a certain point. But as a matter of fact, he was not the equal of Aglípay in astuteness and bungled matters on all sides. On the whole Nozaleda was not a strong man, and cannot be said to have been a worthy follower of the great Bishop of the Philippines, Domingo de Salazar, who was also a Dominican.

[21] See *ante*, note 19.

[22] See this treaty in various publications of the United States; and in Maximo Kalaw, *The Case for the Filipino* (New York, 1916), Appendix A, pp. 249–250.

The negotiations in Paris had been closely watched by the Filipino insurgent leaders who had vainly endeavored to intervene therein. The signing of the treaty meant the downfall of their hopes for an immediate independence. As a consequence, relations between the United States forces and the insurgents, none too good at any time, became more strained, and it was easy to predict the ultimate rupture—a break made all the more certain because the insurgent leaders had been deluded with the hope that public opinion in the United States would at the last decide in their favor. On February 4, two days before the ratification of the treaty by the Senate, the threatened insurrection against the United States broke out.[23]

No longer could the revolt be rightly called a protest against the Spanish friar, for while by the terms of the treaty the friars might remain in the islands, freedom of worship was, as seen above, specifically provided for, and the friar organizations were automatically barred from the political field, and their members no longer had any political rights other than those of lay persons. The insurrection now waged against the United States was political, and the rallying cry was "Independence" although the masses had only a very vague idea of what independence meant.

Aglípay, as above seen, remained in the insurgent camp, where the outbreak of hostilities against the United States found him, and where by reason of his natural astuteness and his religious character, he exercised considerable influence. After the capture of Malolos, the capital of the so-called Philippine republic, he accompanied the insurgent forces on their flight northward. To Aglípay is very largely due the participation of the Ilokos in the insurrection against the United States, for under the very eyes of the American forces he adroitly turned the people into the rebel ranks. Not only did he accomplish this, but he was able to collect many thousands of pesos for the insurgent cause, and finally he himself became one of the guerrilla leaders and led many forays and delivered many surprise attacks against the enemy. That he was a cause of trouble and apprehension is evident from the

[23] This period has been well covered by LEROY, *The Americans in the Philippines*. See also CHARLES B. ELIOTT, *The Philippines to the End of the Military Régime* (Indianapolis, 1916).

despatches sent to Manila by United States officers in the field.[24] Upon the failure of the insurrection, he was one of the last of the leaders to take the oath of allegiance to the United States.

All this has very little to do directly with the Aglípay Schism and the Filipino Independent Church, but it forms a very necessary background if one would see the roots of the schism. As soon as Aglípay had been appointed "military chaplain" of Aguinaldo's forces and vicar-general of the Archipelago, smarting, in common with the rest of the Filippino clergy, over the fact that Filipinos were not preferred or scarcely considered in the appointments to benefices, he began to assume the powers of a bishop or archbishop, and to manipulate the Filipino clergy as he wished. This assumption of power, although it was winked at for some time by Bishop Hevia Campomanes and Archbishop Nozaleda, and other acts, finally led to Aglípay's excommunication.[25] In March of 1899, Aglípay, quoting at considerable length from Nozaleda's famous war pastoral, rained invective upon the latter for his changed sentiments and actions now that

[24] See the despatches in *Annual Reports of the War Department for the Fiscal Year ended June* 30, 1900, part II, 329–334. Aglípay, in his article in the *Independent* (see *ante*), defended himself from the charge of cruelty and declared that war records in Washington prove his case.

[25] Aglípay was excommunicated April 29, 1899, and the sentence of excommunication was exposed from May 4 to June 5 in the archiepiscopal tribunal of Manila. The document fills three large printed pages and is entitled: "Sentence pronounced by the Ecclesiastical Tribunal of the Archbishopric of Manila in the trial against the priest of the said archbishopric, Gregorio Aglípay, for obstructing the exercise of the episcopal jurisdiction, and for various other crimes which he committed." The document recites that on November 22, 1898, Aglípay was summoned to appear, but as his address was not known the summons was without effect. Thereupon notices were affixed to the parish churches of Manila and its suburbs for ten days beginning on December 23. This likewise being without avail, peremptory summons were posted on January 9, requiring Aglípay to present himself under the penalty, in case of non-compliance, of being declared rebellious and contumacious But this also served no purpose and the pronouncement was made. In the *expediente* drawn up against Aglípay, it was stated that on September 4, 1898, Aglípay, making use of the title "Military chaplain of the revolutionary army", and claiming plenary powers to confer with the Filipino clergy, sent a circular to the clergy in the province of Pangasinan of the Diocese of Nueva Segovia, in which he set forth that he considered it proper to appoint a provisional vicar general for the Diocese in view of the absence of the Bishop. Accordingly he made such an appointment. Also Aglípay published and distributed two circulars, October 21 and 22, respectively. The first was addressed "To the Filipino Clergy," and in it he attributed to himself the office of military vicar general and as such drew up a set of regulations for the guidance of the clergy The second circular was addressed "To my very dear brethren of the Filipino Clergy", and in it Aglípay explained that he had been appointed military vicar-general by Aguinaldo and advised them no longer to recognize the Spanish prelates in charge of the dioceses. Aglípay was accordingly found guilty of usurpation of power. "The two circulars . . . with their schismatic tendencies and their constant appeals to the support of the civil power are directly for the purpose of separating the Clergy of this Archbishopric and that of the suffragan Bishoprics from their legitimate shepherds." The regulations promulgated by Aglípay provided that any Filipino priest who refused to subscribe to them should not be allowed to exercise his ministry. He was accordingly declared to have incurred major excommunication.

Spain was no longer in control.[26] On October 23, of the same year, an ecclesiastical assembly convoked by Aglípay in Tarlac, and to which came delegates from the several dioceses, approved Aglípay's appointment by Aguinaldo as head of the Filipino church, but declared adherence to Rome.[27] The next move of importance was the attempt to negotiate with the Pope by direct intervention through the papal legate in Spain, Monsignor Nava de Bontifé, these negotiations being conducted by one Isabelo de los Reyes.[28] These came to naught, but prepared the way more fully for the schism,[29] and Reyes, both in his report to Agoncillo, then acting for the Filipinos as their agent in Europe, and in his paper, counseled a break with Rome.

This, however, seems not to have met with Aglípay's approval, at least not immediately. In 1901, Reyes returned to Manila, where he immediately engaged in propaganda work. It was probably very largely at his initiative that Aglípay sought an interview with the Protestant ministers in Manila in the month

[26] See *ante*, note 16.

[27] Shortly after this assembly, the insurgents were forced to retire to the northern part of Luzon.

[28] The Ilokano, Isabelo de los Reyes, at present an official in the Government of the Philippines, was described by Taft in a report of November 10, 1902 (see *Report of the Philippine Commission*, 1902, i, 39), as "an agitator of irresponsible and irrepressible character". LEROY, *Philippine Life in Town and Country* (New York, 1905, p. 166), says of him: "It is true that the chief agitator connected with the movement, Isabelo de los Reyes, is a hopeless craver of notoriety and a fluent but shallow demagogue, the last man one might wish to see exercising influence among his people, when their own future good is held in view. He, more than the leading clerics connected with the movement, clung with tenacity to the idea of launching it in 1902, and he has written into its *Doctrine and Constitutional Rules* a lot of fantastic ideas about Christian Socialism, being a socialist of the Latin-European school (so nearly as he knows what he is) and a free-thinker so far as religious faith or practice is concerned." See also LEROY, *The Americans in the Philippines*, i, 129; ii, 200, 215, 268. Reyes was arrested in Manila in 1897 as a dangerous person and deported to Spain, where he was held a prisoner until after the signing of the Treaty of Paris. From November 25, 1899 to June 10, 1901, he edited an anti-American paper in Madrid, called *Filipinas ante Europa*. During the time he has spent in the islands since then he has been identified with various movments, most of which he started himself. As will be seen, unless he was adroitly used by Aglípay (which may be possible) Reyes was chiefly responsible for the establishment of the Filipino Independent Church. RETANA, in *La Iglesia Filipina Independiente*, praises Reyes highly, but since the change of sovereignty in the Philippines, Retana, who had formerly denounced every Filipino effort and every Filipino who dared speak in favor of his people, has made a complete about-face, and his later writings are quite different, so that it is advisable to check up his information from other sources (a hasty examination of his *La Política en Espana* and his later *Vida y Escritos del Dr. José Rizal* is sufficient proof of this). Reyes, like many other Ilokanos, is a man of considerable initiative and force, and in many ways a likable man, but he has been accused by many Filipinos of being somewhat of a *poseur* and a demagogue.

[29] Reyes in his negotiations with Monsignor Nava de Bontifé attempted to gain full recognition for the Filipino clergy, offering it is said that, were this granted, the friars held prisoners by the insurgents would be liberated. The nuncio's reply, according to Reyes, was "that even should the friars be beheaded, Rome would not appoint Filipino bishops and would not even appoint a special deputy to go to examine into the capacity of our priests." See RETANA, *ut supra*, p. 351.

of August, 1901,[30] in order to discuss religious affairs in the Philippines. The meeting was held in the office of the American Bible Society in the walled city. Aglípay, in describing the religious situation, denounced the friars in strong terms, accusing them among other things of systematic discrimination against the native clergy, and of having created great unrest among the Filipinos. He asserted also that he intended to head the independent church movement and asked the cooperation of the Protestants,[31] saying that his program embraced a separation from the Roman Catholic Church and the preaching of the Catholic doctrine in its purity. To his overtures the Protestant ministers cautiously replied that they could not unite with any attempt that did not make the scriptures the rule and guide in doctrine and in life, at the same time urging him to study the situation more carefully and inviting him to join the Protestant movement. They pointed out that a program simply of negation and protest would lead nowhere.[32] In taking his leave, Aglípay promised to consider the matter carefully.[33] No other meeting was evidently held between the schismatics and the Protestant ministers until after the schism was launched in 1902. After the new church was actually established interviews are said to have been held with the Episcopalians under Bishop Brent, from whom advice was received on several points. Any attempts made by the Protestants, however, to guide and control the movement were not altogether successful, and it is difficult to see how success could have been assured to them, with Reyes in virtual control. It was, indeed, very largely due to their advice that a wide distribution of the Bible was made by the schismatics among the Filipinos, and their influence can perhaps be detected in several other directions. But their hope

[30] See HOMER C. STUNTZ, *The Philippines and the Far East* (Cincinnati, 1904), p. 489. Stuntz was for several years the Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the Philippines. At the conference were present the Rev. J. C. Goodrich, agent of the Bible Society, the Rev. James B. Rodgers, senior missionary of the Presbyterian Church, the Rev. J. L. McLaughlin and Bishop Stuntz of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and Aglípay and Reyes, the last of whom Stuntz describes as "a Filipino gentleman of good education and an inveterate fondness for agitation".

[31] Aglípay had previously subscribed to Nozaleda's description of the Protestant heretics in his pastoral letter (see *ante*, note 16), and Stuntz records that he had often spoken of the Protestants as "the off-scouring of the earth." Consequently, what is described as "an indication of his intellectual hospitality" in seeking the interview is rather an indication that he was ready to continue his old tactics so strikingly shown by his shady negotiations between the Spaniards and the insurgents.

[32] STUNTZ, *ut supra*, p. 490.

[33] *Ibid.* Aglípay was advised to consider the advisability of having a married clergy and of declaring against "mariolatry."

that the schism might eventually prove a half-way station to Protestantism has never been realized and never could be realized. It is true that Protestantism did gain some few converts because of the schism, but these were not sufficient in number to make any great difference either one way or the other.

Reyes, meanwhile, had succeeded in organizing the first labor union in the Archipelago—an organization thought by some to be anti-American (and it probably was)—in which he attempted to put into force the socialistic theories which he had absorbed in Europe. He proposed to make use of this body in his projected break with Rome, and it was, in fact, at a meeting of the union on August 3, 1901, that the schism was proclaimed.[34] Without his consent, Aglípay was chosen to head the movement, and a number of bishops were appointed. Either at this time or somewhat later, Governor Taft, Dr. T. H. Pardo de Tavera, and others were somewhat arrogantly appointed as honorary officials—an honor that it is needless to say was never accepted. Aglípay promptly refused to be a party to the schism, either because he considered the time as yet immature, or because he shrank from severing all relations with Rome. When Reyes insisted by saying that the Filipinos had a right to make use of the freedom of worship clause in the Treaty of Paris, and that the recognition of the Filipino clergy was an honor, Aglípay still refused and even published a manifesto on August 20, refusing to identify himself with the movement.[35]

He was unable to stem the tide by this act, and many of the native clergy went over to the schism, especially those of the Ilokos provinces. The creation of Pedro Brillantes as Bishop of Ilokos Norte was made a special occasion by Reyes, who served in the capacity (perhaps self-appointed) of President of the Supreme Executive Committee, and this display had a great influence on the Filipinos who thus beheld one of their race receiving the high ecclesiastical honors which they had so long desired.[36] Aglípay's vacillation was soon to disappear, and finally refusing the advice of the Jesuits to submit quietly to his excom-

---

[34] RETANA, *ut supra*, p. 353; LEROY in the *Independent*, April 28, 1904, lvi, pp. 953–957.

[35] RETANA, *ut supra*, p. 353.

[36] The ordination was performed by twelve priests with all possible solemnity. The question of ecclesiastical authority seems to have been brushed aside lightly by Reyes and his assistants.

munication, in the hope of obtaining pardon from Rome,[37] he finally threw in his lot with the schismatics by signing (October 17, 1902) the third epistle of the new church,[38] and nine days later, he celebrated his first Mass as Obispo Maximo[39] of the Philippine Independent Church in the open air near the church in the suburb of Tondo.[40]

In the meantime, events of considerable importance to the Philippines had been taking place in Rome. During several months of 1902, Taft, who had been sent to Rome, conducted his memorable negotiations for the purchase of the friar estates. During these negotiations the subject of the withdrawal of the friars from the Philippines was discussed. Taft dwelt on the objection of the Filipinos to the return of the Spanish friars as parish priests, and the lack of a sufficient number of secular priests. It was therefore proposed that native, foreign, or American priests be substituted for the friars.[41] To Taft's proposal, the Vatican made reply that the proposal to withdraw the friars from the Philippines within a definite fixed period could not be accepted because this would not be justified by *force majeure*, and would violate rights granted by the Treaty of Paris and involve the Holy See in a dispute with Spain. The Vatican also asked how the Pope could order the withdrawal of the friars if the United States could not lawfully do so. A promise was made, however, to introduce the clergy of other nations gradually and that the friars should not return to the parishes.[42] A verbal promise is said to have been made to remove the friars as soon as possible from the islands.[43]

Had Taft been able to announce definitely upon his return to Manila that the friars were to be withdrawn, the schismatic movement would probably have slackened and soon have died of inertia.[44] Notwithstanding the *éclat* with which the schism

---

[37] RETANA, *ut supra*, p. 353; and LEROY, *The Aglipay Schism in the Philippines*, in the *Independent*, April 28, 1904, lvi, pp. 953–957.

[38] The first two epistles were signed by Reyes.

[39] Episcopus Maximus.

[40] STUNTZ, *The Philippines and the Far East*, p. 490; LEROY in the *Independent*, April 28, 1904, lvi.

[41] The *Independent*, May 22, 1902, liv.

[42] The *Independent*, July 10, 1902, liv.

[43] The *Independent*, January 1, 1904, lvi, pp. 13–18.

[44] *Ibid.*

had been launched in Ilokos Norte by the "ordination" of Bishop Brillantes and at Manila by Aglípay's formal adhesion, it had already begun to dwindle very markedly through the feeling of some of its foremost clergymen that the time had now come to make peace with Rome, on account of the failure of

> Filipinos of standing to identify themselves in any great number with the movement which had been engineered by recognized radicals in politics and religion, and on account, too, of the discredit attaching to the political agitator who had been chiefly instrumental in launching the new movement.[45]

But Taft was unable to make any statement to this effect. Toward the end of 1902, the new Apostolic Delegate to the Philippines, Monsignor Guidi, the successor of Archbishop Chapelle of New Orleans, arrived in Manila. On December 2, he published the encyclical letter (*Quae mare sinico*) written in September by the Pope to the Filipinos. There was an immediate upheaval. There was no longer thought of an accord with Rome. The schism received new recruits every moment from all parts of the Archipelago. Now the Independent Church received the impetus that was to bind it together and give it the force that might make it a serious antagonist of Mother Church. Filipinos, on finding that there was no hint in the letter of a withdrawal of the friars, declared that they were being fed once more on promises of secularization which would never materialize. They saw in the letter, indeed, as was said, only an intention on the part of the papacy to fasten the friars upon them forever.[46] Guidi's appointments of American bishops to take the place of the former Spanish prelates,[47] as well as his other efforts to please the Filipinos, had little effect, for the idea of nationalization of the clergy was fast rooting itself, and in the heat of the moment many, who in calmer moments would have hesitated to come to the breaking point, now threw off allegiance to Rome and joined the schism. Some slight consideration of the letter will not be out of place here.[48]

---

[45] LeRoy, *Philippine Life in Town and Country*, p. 164.

[46] LeRoy (*Philippine Life in Town and Country*, p. 164) calls the publication of the letter a political mistake.

[47] Aglípay expressed the general feeling when he said (*Independent*, October 29, 1903): "We resent the sending of French, Italian, Hottentot, American, or any other friar-controlled priests to rule us."

[48] It is given in full in *The American Catholic Quarterly Review*, for April, 1903 (xxviii, pp. 372–379). See also LeRoy in the *Independent*, January 1, 1904, lvi, pp. 13–18. LeRoy says that this letter was too often ignored or interpreted too optimistically.

In his introduction, Pope Leo XIII congratulated the Philippines on the fact that

> the change which the fortunes of war have wrought in civil matters , , , has affected religion also; for when the Spanish yoke was removed the patronage of the Spanish kings ceased, and as a result the Church attained to a larger share of liberty, ensuring for everyone rights which are safe and unassailable.

The first and second of the twelve sections in the letter created four new suffragan bishoprics, which were to be included in the Archbishopric of Manila, and the next two sections provided for the proper ecclesiastical chapters for all sees and the government of vacant sees.[49] Section five concerned the secular clergy, the letter ordering that the number of the native clergy must be increased by the several bishops, but extreme care should be exercised in their appointment, and they were to be men of piety and character and worthy the trust of spiritual charges. Those who proved most efficient were to be gradually given the more responsible posts. Priests were enjoined not to mix in party strife, and in a very special manner not to become involved in worldly affairs. Complete harmony should prevail among all, seculars and regulars, this to be further incited by means of occasional synods convened by the bishops, while the triennial retreat was counseled as an efficacious means for preserving priestly fervor.

The next section advised that each diocese have its own conciliar seminary, the administration of which was to be entrusted by the bishop "to one of the clergy, whether secular or religious, who is distinguished for his services and experience in governing, and for holiness of life." Students for the seminaries were to be selected with care, and some of the best men were to be sent to Rome for education there. The Holy See, it was promised,

> will do its share in the most effective way to advance the secular clergy in higher learning and better ecclesiastical training so that, in good time, it may be worthy to assume the pastoral charges now administered by the regular priests.

[49] It was enjoined that there should be a College of Canons attached to the Metropolitan Cathedral of at least ten persons, whose support was to be provided for by the Apostolic Delegate. In case the suffragan sees found it impossible to have a College of Canons, each bishop was to have consultors in their place, who should be men of piety, learning, and practical experience and who should be chosen either from the regulars or seculars. This section was objected to strenuously by the Filipinos, who said that all such consultors would be friars.

Section 7 praised the Dominican University of Santo Tomás (founded in 1610) in high terms and confirmed it as a pontifical institution of equal rank to other pontifical universities. The next section had to do with the regular clergy, and was as follows:

> Yielding to the opportunities of the new order of things in that region the Holy Apostolic See has decided to make suitable provision for the religious men who look to a manner of life proper to their Institute, devoted entirely to the duties of the sacred ministry, for the advancement of public morality, the increase of Christianity and other peaceful intercourse. We commend earnestly, therefore, to the members of the Religious Orders to discharge holily the duties which they have assumed when pronouncing their vows, "giving no offense to any man". We command them to keep their rule of cloister inviolably; and wish therefore that all should be bound by the decree issued by the Congregation of Bishops and Regulars, July 20, 1731, which Clement XIII, our predecessor confirmed by Apostolic letters *Nuper pro parte*, August 26, the same year. The rule and boundary of the cloister are those which are laid down in another decree issued with the approbation of Pius VI by the Sacred Congregation for the Propagation of the Faith, August 24, 1780. For the rest, the Religious who labor in the Philippines must remember to treat with great reverence and honor those whom the Holy Ghost hath placed to rule the Church of God; and bound together with the secular clergy by the closest ties of concord and charity, let them hold nothing more pressing than to work hand in hand, throwing all their energy into the work of the ministry and the building up of the body of Christ. Furthermore, to remove every element of dissension, we wish that in the Philippine Islands the constitution *Fernandis* of Benedict XII, dated November 6, 1744, and the other *Romanos Pontifices*, May 8, 1881, in which which we decided certain points in dispute between the Bishops and Missionary Regulars in England and Scotland, be observed.

By section 9, the Bishops, after conferring with the superiors of the several orders, were to determine those parishes that were to be given to regulars; and any question that could not be settled privately was to be referred to the Apostolic Delegate. The next section provided for missions and advised that it was desirable that one house with capacity for eight religious men be founded in each province. These men should be obliged to visit the towns and villages in order to exhort the people to better life. Mission stations were in time to become Prefectures or Vicariates-Apostolic This section also provided for the collection of alms. The last two sections enjoined obedience to ecclesiastical discipline and reverence for those in authority.

The letter was criticised from one end of the Philippines to the other as being pro-friar and as giving no relief to the Filipinos. Guidi, who was a man of great good sense, counseled that the wishes of the people be met so far as possible, but he was unable to stem the tide of revolt aroused again by the letter. The excitement caused by the formal launching of the schism, great as it had been, was not equal to that brought about by the resentment against the letter and the fear lest friar rule be once more established. The consequence was that many who would have nothing to do with the schism before now embraced it eagerly, and it grew rapidly. In Ilokos Norte, there were only three priests who held out with their congregations.[50] It is asserted, however, that no priest joined the movement unless followed by his congregation.[51] Aglípay claimed over 3,000,000 adherents,[52] but this number is altogether too high. LeRoy,[53] with more conservatism, and probably with far more correctness, places the number at about 2,000,000; while Stuntz[54] places it at only about 1,500,000. The governor at Malolos said that 80 per cent of the people of his province were Roman Catholics and the remainder Aglipayans and Protestants.[55] As a matter of fact, most of the people were loyal to Rome, but were hostile to the friars and joined the movement as a protest against what they felt to be an injustice or because they simply followed their leaders. Devins observed that the chief success of the movement lay in towns where the priest and the people were not on good terms, and thought that the personal feeling entered largely into the matter of secession.[56] It was claimed that as many as 200 Filipino Roman Catholic priests went over to the schismatic church,[57] and this is probably not far from correct, for the new organization made a powerful appeal to the growing feeling of nationality and personal ambition. The movement was Filipino throughout and Filipinos who refused to join the schism were called unpatriotic, with the result that many who had little or no

[50] STUNTZ, *Philippines and the Far East*, p. 491.
[51] H. PARKER WILLIS, *Our Philippine Problem* (New York, Holt, 1905), p. 212.
[52] *Independent*, October 29, 1903.
[53] *Philippine Life in Town and Country*, p. 165.
[54] STUNTZ, *Philippines and the Far East*, p. 492.
[55] JOHN BANCROFT DEVINS, *An Observer in the Philippines* (Boston, 1905), p. 80.
[56] *An Observer in the Philippines*, p. 80.
[57] LEROY, *ut supra*, p. 165.

religious concern gave it their adherence.[58] It is easily seen how the national sentiment might make officials apprehensive of another armed revolt, but as a matter of fact, danger from this source was never very great, although many of the rising party of Nationalists belonged to the new church.

The movement was lacking in one very great essential. It was without any great, compelling moral or religious force. Indeed no great demands of a religious or moral nature were made upon those who joined it, and this easy program brought many adherents. The general average of morality among the native Filipino clergy during much of the Spanish regime was not high. The American clergy has succeeded in introducing a far higher standard than prevailed before. While Aglípay himself has never been accused of immorality, he failed to set up a moral standard either for the priests of his church or for the people. The cockpit, gambling and other vices were allowed free course both among clergy and laymen.[59] Young priests were ordained "with somewhat startling ease and carelessness in the seminaries" opened by the schismatics, and fitness was not always considered a requisite, either in training or in character.[60]

Not only was this so, but the church was built on a false foundation, for while the printed rules and other published material gave the organization a far different setting than that possessed by the faith its adherents had abandoned, in actual practice the ritual has remained the same, the Mass, indeed, being "adopted in its entirety as celebrated by the Romanists",[61] although beliefs as announced are at wide variance with the teachings of the Church. The doctrines of the new church were set forth by one of its prominent members, who was probably none other than Reyes himself, as rationalistic and conforming rigorously to the

[58] Stuntz, *ut supra*, p. 490.

[59] Stuntz, *ut supra*, p. 494. Ambrose Coleman, O. P. (*American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1905) says that "neither clergy nor laity know what they believe and are drifting."

[60] LeRoy, *Philippine Life in Town and Country*, p. 165; John Foreman, *The Philippine Islands* (New York, 1906), p. 606.

[61] *Doctrina y Reglas Constitucionales de la Iglesia Filipina Independiente* (Manila, Imprenta-Tipografía de Modesto Reyes y Cía, 1904), p. 13. Rev. Ambrose Coleman, O.P. (*American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1905), says: "The real absurdity is that the Aglipayans, while denying fundamental doctrines and rejecting the Nicene and Athanasian creeds, keep up all the Roman ritual, cultivate modern devotions, practice the cult of the saints, and carry their statues in procession, pray for the dead and offer up the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Their actions do not accord with their speech. They denounce in public what they themselves publicly practice."

results of modern science.[62] Darwinism was accepted and harmonized with the biblical doctrine. The Trinity was denied, but a belief expressed in the Trinity of attributes and names. The explanation of this idea accepted by the new church was said to be entirely new and peculiar to the church itself. All this was said to be based on scriptural text plus rationalistic writings. The doctrine of original sin was denied, as well as the view that such sin was expiated through Jesus Christ; although it was maintained that Jesus Christ's sacrifice redeemed humanity from its own errors, weaknesses, and passions by means of divine attributes and inimitable example, but not by the actual material sacrifice. In its rules and constitution, the schismatic church, said this informant, aimed to establish the more pure democracy and common holding of wealth which Jesus Christ preached and the Apostles practiced—this being clearly part of the socialistic tenets foisted in by Reyes. The veriest layman can readily understand the contradiction between such sentiments and the taking over of the Mass as celebrated in the Catholic Church. This was part of the false basis on which the church was builded, for the practices of the organization said one thing and the declaration of principles another. But it is probably a fact that in very few instances was there any conception among the members of the church or of the priests other than those of the teaching of Rome. There was no frank attempt, so far as can be seen, to make expressed beliefs and practices harmonize. Thus expressed beliefs were in some instances more at variance with the tenets of the Catholic Church than are the doctrines of any other Christian church, yet Aglipayans could at any time go back to the old Church and scarcely know the difference so far as actual practices were concerned. There was often a glib juggling of ecclesiastical words and phrases that sounded loudly but meant little.

Much of the published material of the church is an attempt to set forth the peculiar views of the chief founder, but it is doubtful whether he himself, in many instances, could give a satisfactory explanation of what has been written and compiled. The haste with which much of the material was put together, and lack of scholarship and proper foundation, account for its

[62] Willis, *Our Philippine Problem*, p. 209.

curious and often amusing and contradictory ideas. Among the most interesting of the published material of the organization are the six epistles, the first two of which were signed by Reyes and the last four by Aglípay. The first epistle, dated September 29, 1902, was addressed to the bishops-elect of the new church and outlined the method of episcopal consecration to be followed.[63] The next epistle of October 2, was a reply to Bishop Alcocer, who had denounced the schism. In it strong protest was made to the bringing in of foreign priests and the education of a Filipino clergy advocated. That of October 17 was a declaration of principles, in which it was stated that "we have separated from Rome not only through the very human question of the expoliation of the Filipino clergy in ecclesiastical dignities and possessions, but also and chiefly through the imperious necessity of reëstablishing the worship of the only true God in all its splendor and the purity of His most holy word", while various beliefs and practices of the Roman Catholic Church were condemned. Parts of this epistle were embodied in the *Doctrina y Reglas Constitucionales.* The fourth epistle (October 29, 1902) advised the formation of various organizations in each province and municipality, and emphasized the need of priests. Efforts were to be made to gain possession of churches, parochial buildings, and cemeteries, of which Filipinos were the legitimate owners, and new churches should be built. Excommunications by Roman Catholic prelates should be disregarded. The epistle of December 8, was a long attack on the encyclical of Pope Leo XIII, and the last one (August 17, 1903), denounced as illogical the action of certain Roman Catholic Filipinos in the diocese of Jaro who revolted against the papal discipline but continued to acquiesce in Catholic dogma. In this epistle, which was signed by Aglípay and thirteen bishops, Aglípay took occasion to review the short history of the schism. He declared

> Our church is Catholic, that is, universal, because it is in reality profoundly cosmopolitan by conviction and sentiments, considering all men, without distinction, as Sons of God, and takes the name "Filipino Independent

[63] Of the new church and its attitude toward consecration, DEVINS (*An Observer in the Philippines*, p. 254), says: "Aglipayanism is spectacular rather than substantial. A deposed priest styling himself Archbishop, and placing other priests in bishoprics, is amusing rather than edifying. Apparently, the man, while dead in earnest, does not see the incongruity of assuming and transmitting ecclesiastical authority with no organized body behind him, and he goes forth armed only with uncertain power."

> Church" simply to characterize this group of freemen, who within the aforesaid universality admit servitude to no one.
>
> . . . . . .
>
> He who teaches doctrines contrary to those ideas that favor our liberty and our progress cannot be a good Filipino or friend of our people, for he leads us into slavery and brutishness.

Among other published writings are the following: *Doctrina y Reglas Constitucionales de la Iglesia Filipina Independiente*, Manila, 1904; *Oficio Divino de la Iglesia Filipina Independiente*, Barcelona, 1906; *Lecturas de Cuaresma para la Iglesia Filipina Independiente*, Barcelona, 1906; *Biblia Filipina*, Barcelona, 1908 (published in parts but never finished); *Calendario de la Iglesia Filipina Independiente para . . .* 1908 (perhaps an annual publication). The second and fourth are compilations, etc., by Reyes, and are very curious publications, well worth examination if one cares to see what was gravely handed out to the adherents of the new church as of the deepest concern for the rule of life and conduct. The first is, as its title indicates, a book of rituals, and contains selections from the scriptures with elucidations, etc.; and the second, so far as published, is a treatise on the creation and on the origin of religion. Of all the writings, the *Doctrina* and the epistles (published in one pamphlet) are the most important. In addition to the above material, Aglípay also had an official organ called *La Verdad* (the truth), for which he claimed a circulation of 10,000.

The formal launching of the new sect in Manila had aroused intense excitement, but, as seen above, an apathy was fast succeeding to the first enthusiasm. The fuel supplied by the encyclical letter of Pope Leo XIII was eagerly seized upon by the leaders of the movement, and they sought in every way possible to accentuate the fear of friar domination. With the organization that had already been built up, they were able to manipulate matters very shrewdly and skilfully, and before long the Aglípay Church had received an impetus that has carried it (though with decreasing membership and influence) to the present day. They were helped by the freedom of worship ushered in with the American Government, but freedom of worship was not understood, either by Aglipayans or Roman Catholics. On the one hand the Aglipayans appealed to the Government asking that the friars be withdrawn, and on the other, the Roman Catholics asked the

suppression of the Independent Church. Taft, in his report of November 10, 1902,[64] shortly after the launching of the movement, tells how he answered these requests:

> I have taken occasion to say, whenever an opportunity occurred, that the Insular Government desired to take no part whatever in the religious controversies thus arising; that it would protect Father Aglípay and his followers in worshiping God as they chose just as it would protect the Roman Catholic Church and its ministers and followers in the same rights. But that, if the law was violated by either party, it would become the duty of the government to step in and restrain such lawlessness.

And he adds with great truth:

> In the heat and zeal of religious controversies, it is not always possible to prevent the followers of the movement at least from stepping beyond the law, and if the movement is to spread throughout the Archipelago, we may expect disturbances at various points.

The controversies centered, in general, on the ownership of the churches and other ecclesiastical edifices and property, and this led to Taft's so-called "proclamation of peaceable possession." The revolting congregations generally claimed the buildings and property on the ground that they belonged to the people because they had been built by their labor. Aglípay declared that the Filipinos distinguished between the land acquired for cultivation and the church buildings and convents; and that it was not a question of the ownership of lands acquired with good title. But the churches and convents, he said, were the indisputable property of the Filipinos. One of the Filipino arguments was as follows:

> Every dollar of money was collected by the Government of Spain by taxing the people to erect the churches, and the labor was done by *polista*, each person being compelled by the Government to work fifteen days or pay the equivalent. There is not a human being in possession of his senses, knowing the facts, who would suggest that because the Roman Catholic priests were servants of the State that therefore State property belongs to an Italian in Rome. Rome never put a dollar into the parish buildings.[65]

That is, the argument amounted to saying that because the Spanish Crown had exercised the royal patronage in ecclesiastical affairs in the Philippines, that patronage descended to the United States by the transfer of the rights of Spain to the latter country—an argument that is absurd because the Constitution

---

[64] *Third Annual Report of the Philippine Commission*, i, p. 39.
[65] *Independent*, October 29, 1903.

of the United States expressly forbids governmental intervention in religious matters. At times the Roman Catholic prelates and priests allowed themselves to be carried beyond the bounds of prudence in excess of zeal; and the same was equally true of the party of the Independent Church.[66]

It was early settled that the only recourse of either party in the controversy lay in the courts. An opinion handed down by the solicitor general, December 9, 1902, on the question of the "ownership and possession, under canonical law, of chapels erected in barrios, for the celebration of mass by a priest of the Roman Catholic Church at stated intervals" was as follows:

> The chapels referred to in the present inquiry, although erected for the benefit of the residents of the respective barrios, from the fact that they are open to the public, are unquestionably entitled to be considered as public oratories. As such, they are sacred ecclesiastical places. Their ownership, according to the commonly accepted opinion of canon law writers, vests in the Roman Catholic Church of the Philippine Islands, their administration pertaining to the priest or Catholic minister appointed by the bishop, subject to the supervision of the said bishop, and to the eminent domain of the Roman pontiff. All this is without prejudice to any right of patronage that may have been acquired. The priests who administer said chapels have the right of possession thereof, and the holding of the keys by a patron or other person is not a possession adverse to that of the administrator, but, on the contrary, is a right exercised in behalf of said administrator or of the Catholic Church.[67]

And on the 23d of the same month, another opinion was handed down on the following matter:

> A parish priest in actual possession and actually administering a parish church of the Roman Catholic Church, leaves the Roman Catholic communion and joins the Independent Filipino Catholic Church, remaining in possession of the parish church and refusing, in obedience to the orders of the Catholic Bishop of the diocese, to yield possession to a newly appointed priest of the Roman Catholic Church directed to act as parish priest and to take possession of the church.
>
> Is it the duty of the Civil Governor, or of the provincial governor, or of some executive officer of the peace of the pueblo, on demand of the Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church, to put the new priest having the authority of the Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church in possession of the parish church, or must the Bishop appeal to judicial proceedings to dispossess the apostate priest and secure possession of his new agent, the new parish priest of the Roman Catholic Church?

In answering this question, the solicitor-general said:

---

[66] See *Independent*, April 28, 1904; STUNTZ, *The Philippines and the Far East*, p. 495; and AMBROSE COLEMAN, O.P., in the *American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1905.

[67] *Official Gazette* (Manila, 1902), p. 6.

In the present case there is a controversy between the schismatic priest and the Roman Catholic Bishop with respect to the possession and consequent administration of the parish church. The former claims the right to remain in possession of and to administer the parish church in the name of the Filipino Independent Catholic Church, the said Church believing itself to have the right to said parish church by the change of belief of the priest and the parishioners; and the latter claiming that the parish church as the property of the Roman Catholic Church in the Philippine Islands, should continue to have such character the schismatic priest, therefore, having no right to continue in the possession and occupancy of said church, and claiming the right to appoint a priest of the Roman Catholic faith in substitution of such schismatic priest.

The determination of such a function is not a matter of the executive power. Its determination comes within the province of the Courts of Justice by reason of their functions. To deprive the schismatic priest of the possession of the parochial church, and deliver such possession to the new Roman Catholic priest, would imply an examination of the question as to which of the contending parties has the right to the possession and administration of each parochial church, and a decision that such right belongs to the Roman Catholic Bishop—functions purely judicial not executive.

. . . . . .

Article 46 of the Civil Code still in force in these islands provides that: "Every possessor has a right to be respected in his possession; and should he be disturbed therein, he must be protected or possession must be restored to him by the means established in this law of procedure." This provision protects the possession, and refers, not only to the civil possessor, that is to say, he who is in possession as owner, but also to the natural possessor, or he who is simply the holder of a thing. Further, the provision refers principally to the possession in fact, and against the disturber of such possession, and the Law of Civil Procedure formerly in force in these Islands provides the remedy of injunctions, summary trials, which were held and decided solely upon the fact of possession.

Continuing, the solicitor-general, based his opinion upon two precedents handed down by the attorney-general of the United States,[68] and concluded by saying:

In view of the foregoing considerations, I am of the opinion that it would not be proper for the Executive to intervene in the question at issue. The Bishop of the Roman Catholic Church must appeal to the courts in support of his claim.[69]

These opinions furnished a basis for Taft's proclamation of peaceable possession. In his report of November 10, he said:

Most of the churches in the Philippine Islands were built by the labor of the people of the respective parishes and devoted to the Roman Catholic Church;

[68] The first was an opinion handed down on October 11, 1838, in regard to the capture of a ship owned in the United States, which was captured as a blockade runner but which escaped to New Orleans; restoration to capture was demanded of the Executive of the United States by the blockading nation. The second, dated November 3, 1843, was a demand made by the owner of an abducted slave. In each case it was stated that the Executive could not restore possession. See *Opinions of the Attorneys General* (U. S.), iii, p. 377, and iv, p. 269.

[69] *Official Gazette*, for January 7, 1903, p. 7.

but the people have a sense of ownership, and when a majority separate themselves from the Roman Catholic Church and accept a new faith, it is difficult for them to understand that they have not the right at once to dispossess the priest of the Roman Catholic Church and place in custody and use of the edifice their newly made curé. In order to prevent constant recurrence of disturbances of the peace I have had to take a firm stand with the leaders of the movement by impressing upon them that forcible dispossession of a priest of the Roman Catholic Church, for years in peaceable possession of the church and rector's house, is contrary to law, and would be prevented by the whole police power. The leaders of the movement assure me that they have no desire to violate the law and wish to keep within it, but that their followers at times are hard to control. I have said to them that if they claim title to the churches, they may assert it through the courts, and if successful, will secure not only the confirmation of their title but actual possession.[70]

There was more or less disturbance throughout the islands because of the Aglipayans' attempts to take possession of the churches, and the demands of the Roman Catholic Church for their restoration. This led at times to unseemly strife, but the matter was greatly simplified by Taft's proclamation.[71] On the whole, the propaganda of the schismatics has been kept within the law,[72] and the Roman Catholics by their recourse to the courts have received back most, if not all, of their churches. In consequence of the necessity of appeal to the courts, the schism diminished greatly, and since with the lapse of time, the fundamental reasons that lay at the bottom of the schismatic church became weakened, the institution has continued to diminish in numbers and importance, and is becoming an incident.[73]

[70] *Third Annual Report of the Philippine Commission*, ii, p. 39.

[71] After Aglipay had celebrated his first Mass, the women of the church of Pandacan, a suburb of Manila, locked their priest out of the church and refused to give up the keys to the Roman Catholics. Aglipay on the invitation of the women celebrated Mass in the church. Taft sent for Aglipay's counsel whom he informed of the unlawful action of the women, and directed that possession be yielded to the proper owner. The women refused to deliver the keys to the owner, whereupon, Taft held an interview with the leaders and ordered them to hand him the keys. This they did with the remark that they would give them to the Governor but not to the fraile. It was after this event that the opinions cited above were handed down, and may have had their origin from this event. *Third Annual Report of the Philippine Commission*, i, p. 39.

Of the proclamation of peaceable possession, STUNTZ (*The Philippines and the Far East*, p. 491) says that it was issued with perfect justice and consummate adroitness. Its operation "quieted public clamor, and trouble was averted".

[72] LEROY, *Philippine Life in Town and Country*, p. 166.

[73] See the *Hearings before Committee on Insular Affairs* on "Catholic Church Claims in the Philippine Islands," held January 16, 20–23, 1908, in the House of Representatives (Washington, Government Printing Office, 1908); and the *Congressional Record*, 60th Cong., First Session, February 14 to March 7, 1908 (Vol xlii, Part 3). The history of the schism was brought out by the questions of the committee. See especially, the decision of the Supreme Court of the Philippines on the appeal from the decision of Barlin vs. Ramirez, by which the right of the Roman Catholic Church to church edifices constructed originally for the use of the communicants of the Roman Catholic Church was affirmed. The case had been first brought in the court of First Instance in 1904 and the decision of the Supreme Court of the Philippines was made in November of 1906. This case had considerable influence in the decrease of the ranks of the Independent Church. See also *Independent*, January 3, 1907.

There has been an attempt in the above pages to show how and why the Aglípay Church came into existence, and to tell something of its history. Due in large part to hostility toward the friar orders, a hostility, moreover, carefully fostered in the masses by the leaders, the new church became a protest against abuses real and fancied. The political element in the organization was not small, for the church was in great part an expression of the growing feeling of nationality. Its spiritual force has been slight, and its moral demands very few.[74] The leaders of the schism flirted with the ministers of the Protestant churches, who while extremely cautious about endorsing the project of the Independent Church, had hopes that Protestantism might have a great impetus because of the schism—a hope that has not been realized although some indirect returns were received.[75]

The schism has been of benefit to Catholicism in the islands. It did cause a greater effort on the part of those who worked for the regeneration of religion, [76] and today the Roman Catholic Church is in a better position because of the Filipino Independent Church. The Roman Catholic Church has had the good fortune to have some men in the Philippines who have had the sympa-

[74] This was well understood by the Protestants. STUNTZ (*The Philippines and the Far East*, p. 495), says: "I am not without hope that Aglípay will yet take a more advanced spiritual and moral ground."

[75] STUNTZ (*The Philippines and the Far East*, pp. 494, 495), says: "The Aglípay movement helps the Protestants by detaching tens of thousands from nominal connection with the Church of Rome. Our preachers get a hearing with them, and thousands of them accept the word and are saved. . . . These people would never have left the Roman Catholic Church to become Protestants, feeble as was the hold of the Church upon them; but once outside and hungry for spiritual food, they hear and are saved. Aglípay loosens the fruit from the tree, and we gather it." DEVINS (*An Observer in the Philippines*, p. 211), in an interview with Aguinaldo, asked him what he thought of Aglípay's work. Aguinaldo replied that he considered it a step in the right direction, but a movement only of the second grade. In time the movement would become first grade and lead into the Protestant Church. It is not an uncommon Filipino characteristic to say the things one wishes to hear.

[76] Of the movement, STUNTZ says (*ut supra*, p. 488): "Whatever may be the future of the movement it has rent the old church in twain from top to bottom and now holds the attention of Catholic leaders to a far greater degree than Protestantism, for the reason that just now it is more to be feared by Catholic leaders than Protestantism." He says also (*ibid.*, p. 496): "The Independent Philippine Church has come to stay. Just how strong a hold it will be able to keep on the multitudes which have flocked to the standard of revolt against the pope cannot be foretold. But it may be reckoned with as a permanent factor in the religious future of the Philippines." See also LEROY, *Independent*, January 1, 1904, and *Philippine Life in Town and Country*, p. 164. REV. AMBROSE COLEMAN, O.P. (*American Catholic Quarterly Review*, April, 1905), predicted that "It may go on for a time in its blundering way, but eventually the more intellectual of its members will drift into atheism and the bulk of those whom it gains among the common people will fall back into the practices of heathenism from which they were weaned by the Spanish friars." Father Coleman was unduly pessimistic. The obvious direction for the majority of the Aglipayan communicants to take if they leave the Independent Church is back to the old church which they had formerly known. Such a course as that predicted by Father Coleman would mean that the more than three centuries of Spanish religious tutelage had been of no effect. He himself said that Aglípay, even after his break with Rome, still believed all Rome's teachings, and he was probably correct

thetic nature requisite for the task before them—such an one was the late Archbishop—and these zealous servants have been able to accomplish much good work. Some of the men sent over, as is natural, have not left there an altogether grateful remembrance among the people. There is a rare opportunity for the Roman Catholic Church to accomplish work of a high order among the Filipinos, who are of an exceedingly ideal temperament, but the greatest of care must be exercised and the greatest of sincerity be always manifest. Those who know the Philippine Islands need not be told that what has happened there once may happen again. The schism has died down largely because the conditions that fostered its rapid growth have either changed or lost in importance. Given an occasion, it might easily be revived, and this notwithstanding the careful work of Church leaders of the last decade and a half.

JAMES A. ROBERTSON, *Managing Editor,*
The Hispanic American Historical Review,
Washington, D. C.

MISCELLANY

BORINQUÉN

Early Days of the Church in Porto Rico

Porto Rico was discovered by Columbus on his second voyage, in 1493, and conquered by the famous seeker for immortal youth, Ponce de León, in 1508. The Indian name of the island was Borinquén, and the aborigines, who soon disappeared under the Spanish system of colonization, were called by the Spaniards "Borinqueños." These terms are now used symbolically and poetically as epithets of the island and its inhabitants, being evidence of the tendency among the former American dependencies of Spain to adopt as typical of the respective countries indigenous, rather than Spanish, ideals and legends, and to glorify the original inhabitants of the land rather than the conquistadores, without, however, detracting from the honors justly due the latter.[1] So to us "Borinquén" may typify pioneer days in the beautiful island, romantically called "the land of perpetual June."

As in all the Spanish colonies, the civilizing and Christianizing ideal went hand in hand in Porto Rico. One of the glories of the Spanish colonizing period is the missionary zeal which characterized almost all the exploring and colonizing expeditions, and which has done much to wipe out the memory of the cruelties and injustice practised by the conquistadores. With each expedition went the priest, to bless and sanctify the undertaking, to say the first Mass in the new land, and often to be the protector of the helpless Indians against his harsher companions. So it is not surprising to find as early as 1493, in a Bull of Pope Alexander VI (May 4, 1493) instructions to the rulers of Spain (who were recognized as having the right of patronage in the Indies) to "send to the said mainlands and islands good, God-fearing men, learned, wise, and skilled, to instruct the natives and inhabitants in the Catholic faith and teach them good customs, applying to it all due diligence." Queen Isabel, in her famous testament, likewise urged upon her daughter Juana the fulfilment of the apostolic mandate. Under date of November 16, 1504, was issued the bull *Illius fulciti praesidio*, which established three Sees in the Indies: the Hiagustensian (metropolitan), the Bagustensian, and the Magutensian. This Bull, however, did not take effect, being repealed by the Bull of August 11, 1511, which

[1] This tendency is especially strong in Peru and Chile, where the Incas and Araucanian Indians are so glorified.

suppressed the dioceses previously created, substituting those of Santo Domingo, Concepción de la Vega, and San Juan (Porto Rico), under the See of Seville as Metropolitan.

For these three Sees were named respectively Don Francisco García de Padilla, Don Pedro Suárez Deza, and Don Alfonso Manso. Of these only the latter two were ever consecrated, Bishop Padilla dying before being consecrated, and his successor, Bishop Geraldino, not being appointed until 1516. Bishop Suárez de Deza did not reach his See until after 1516, so that Bishop Manso, who arrived at Caparra, Porto Rico, in 1513, was the first bishop of the Indies to reach his diocese, and consequently the first bishop in America. This seems borne out by contemporary evidence. (Cf. BRAU, *La Colonización de Puerto Rico*, p. 377.)

The life of this bishop is given in some detail in the episcopology which follows. It is worthy of note that he occupied the See longer than any of his successors (twenty-six years), and that much of his episcopate was passed in conflict with those tendencies which the Church had to combat almost universally during the colonizing period: excesses due to the thirst for gold, cruelty towards the natives, enslaving of the Indians, enmities and dishonorable conduct by the conquistadores towards each other. This truly epic struggle between the Christian missionary ideal and the selfish, wealth-seeking, worldly ideal, a struggle of which the saintly Bartolomé de las Casas was the great protagonist, was waged in Porto Rico as in other lands of the New World, with Bishop Manso as the apostle of right. This "great man and holy person," as González Fernández de Oviedo calls him, used all the faculties and powers he possessed to restrain the fierce, passionate, warlike conquistadores, and succeeded in destroying, or at least lessening, grave and sinful abuses, especially the practice of usury. His campaign against usury brought him into bitter conflict with persons concerned, who were powerful enough to bring complaints against him to the Council of the Indies. The passage of time finally eradicated this, as it has many another, evil.

The historic position of the Church as the patron and protector of learning and the ever-fostering promoter of education is well illustrated in Porto Rico. Hardly had conditions in the new colony settled down to a fairly orderly basis, when the bishop established the Hospital of San Ildefonso, the first in the island, and a Grammar School (Escuela de Gramática). This school was, of course, a "grammar school" in the ancient sense, a cathedral school on the order of those conducted throughout the Middle Ages, and whose historic place in England has only recently been prop-

erly recognized.[2] The curriculum included the humanities, philosophy, and elementary theology. In spite of the lack of priests, the sparseness of the population, the uncertain communications, and the general poverty and insecurity of the island, the school lived and flourished, so that under the episcopate of Bishop Manso's successor we find four of its graduates, natives of the island, receiving Holy Orders, having apparently completed all their studies within the colony. These young men, Gonzalo Domingo, Francisco Díaz de Lepe, Sebastián Sanabria, and Francisco de Liende, were ordained probably in 1548. Under later episcopates many other young men educated in Porto Rico took up the Master's work, and in a sense this school may be said to be the embryo of the present seminary, now happily re-established under the enlightened and progressive administration of the present bishop, Right Reverend William A. Jones, O. S. A. Throughout the history of the diocese constant appeals are made by the bishops to the pastors of the island to teach "not only Christian Doctrine, but also the letters of the alphabet (reading) and writing." In the work of educating the people the Dominicans for many years played a leading rôle.

This brief sketch could not fittingly conclude without a reference to the antiquity of this diocese, now for twenty years under the American flag. When one realizes that its foundation antedated by approximately 100 years the first settlement of the English in America, and that it has actually celebrated its Fourth Centennial (any sort of centennial being of considerable rarity in the Americas), some conception is gained of the historic interest it affords. Nor is the interest wholly historical; its life is the life of the Church in miniature—the struggle with poverty, and evil, and indifference, the years of faithful toil and abnegation, and the ultimate success which must crown the efforts of its present wise government.

HENRY GRATTAN DOYLE, A.M. (Harvard),
Instructor in Spanish, The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[2] *Cf.* LEACH, *The Schools of Medieval England.* New York, 1915.

DOCUMENTS

EPISCOPOLOGY OF PORTO RICO

A Catalogue of the Bishops who have occupied this See, including Bishops-elect who did did not take possession[1]

I. May, 1513. **Dr. Don Alonso Manso.** Secular priest. Native of Becerril de Campos. Licentiate in Theology. Chief sacristan of the Chapel of the Sermo, Prince Don Juan. Canon magistral[2] of Salamanca. First bishop of Porto Rico and first Inquisitor General of the Indies (first bishop in America). Chosen by Pope Julius II for the Magutensian see (island of Hispaniola) by the bull *Illius fulciti praesidio*, dated November 16, 1504, which did not take effect. Nominated by the Catholic Monarchs Ferdinand and Juana, by virtue of the bull *Universalis Ecclesiae* of July 28, 1508, which conceded to the kings If Castile and Leon the perpetual right of patronage and nomination for the ondies. Chosen bishop of Porto Rico by Pope Julius II by the Bull *Romanus Pontifex* of August 8, 1511, establishing this diocese. Entered into a concordat with the Catholic Monarchs in Burgos, May 8, 1512. Established his cathedral from the archiepiscopal palace of Seville, his metropolitan See, Sunday, September 26, 1512. Took possession of his diocese in May, 1513. Named Inquisitor General of the Indies January 7, 1519. Nomination ratified by Catholic Monarchs May 20, 1520. Founded hospital of San Ildefonso for the poor, according to the wish of the Catholic Monarchs, and in it a grammar school (Humanities) which was the first educational institution in Porto Rico. Consecrated in his cathedral in 1529 the bishop-elect of Santo Domingo, Don Sebastián Ramírez de Fuenleal, president of the Real Audiencia (first consecration held in the New World). Died September 27, 1539. Buried in his cathedral, on the gospel side. His tomb, of alabaster, with his statue, recumbent, a lamb at his feet, existed until 1625, when it was destroyed by the Dutch, when they sacked and burned the city.

II. July, 1542. **Don Rodrigo de Bastidas y Rodríguez de Romera.** Secular priest. Native of Santo Domingo, according to contemporary documents, and of Seville, according to an investigation made by Brau. Son of the discoverer of Tierra-Firme and first "*adelantado*"[3] and governor and captain-general of Santa Marta, Rodrigo de Bastidas. Dean of Santo Domingo and many times purveyor and vicar-general *in sede vacante* and *plena*. First bishop of Coro and Venezuela (1532-1540). Governor of Venezuela *ad interim* (1540–1542). Nominated for the see of Porto Rico by the emperor Charles V, Sep-

[1] This valuable document was compiled by Ángel Paniagua Oller for the volume *Sínodo Diocesano del Obispado de Puerto Rico*, published in Porto Rico, 1917. The translation is the work of Henry Grattan Doyle, A. M. (Harvard), Instructor in Spanish, the Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

[2] A "canónigo magistral" is the holder of a canonry the occupant of which must have attained the doctorate.

[3] The "adelantado" was the governor of an outlying, newly settled country.

tember 16, 1540. Chosen and preconized in Rome by Pope Paul III, 1541. Took possession of his diocese in July, 1542. Planned the construction of the present cathedral upon bases of sumptuous grandeur, but lacking the necessary resources its building remained at a standstill after the completion of the main chapel and its appurtenances, as well as the two lateral chapels, reducing the plan for its construction for the future. In his time (January 31, 1545) by bull of Pope Paul III, the Archdiocese of Santo Domingo became metropolitan See of Porto Rico, which diocese had been up to then suffragan of that of Seville. Held in 1547 the first synod of Porto Rico. "A person of great capacity and great reputation, and a great ecclesiastic, and of very good life." He was called in his time "the good bishop." He promoted public instruction very much; he asked of the emperor the abolition of the Holy Office in the island and solicited tax exemptions for agriculture and the reduction of the administrative personnel. Gave Holy Orders to the first four young Porto Ricans, sons of conquistadores and first settlers, to follow the ecclesiastical state, pupils of the grammar school (Escuela de Gramática) and of the classes in theology established by the Preaching Friars in the Convent of Santo Tomás de Aquino (St. Thomas Aquinas). Because of his advanced age he resigned this diocese May 6, 1567, remaining in Santo Domingo to live a retired life on the income of the considerable fortune left him there by his father, the adelantado, of which he made the most charitable use. He was not (as Fr. Iñigo Abbad says erroneously, confusing him with his successor Don Francisco Andrés de Carvajal) promoted to the archiepiscopal See of Santo Domingo, for there is no document to support this, nor does he figure among the prelates of that metropolitan See, occupied at that time by Don Francisco Juan de Aleolares, Dominican. Died before 1570, being buried in the chapel belonging to his family in the cathedral of Santo Domingo, it being possible to read on his tomb the words "*Epis. S. Joanni,*" which proves our assertion.

III. **Don Francisco Andrés de Carvajal.** Franciscan. Native of Alcántara. Student at the College of San Pedro y San Pablo of Alcalá. Guardian of the Franciscan monasteries of Guadalajara and Alcalá. Confessor of the queen, Doña Isabel de la Paz. Preconized June 2, 1568, Governed the diocese scarcely a year. Promoted to the Archbishopric of Santo Domingo November 4, 1568, receiving the pallium July 19, 1570, and died in his archdiocese in 1586. As, apparently, this bishop was only at the head of the diocese for the term of approximately one year, being promoted immediately to the metropolitan See of the Indies, doubtless on that account his brief pontificate, with the lapse of years, has passed unnoticed by the chroniclers, his memory being forgotten and his personality confused with that of his predecessor Bishop Bastidas, attributing to the latter the rise and promotion of Carvajal, and suppressing the name of Carvajal in the catalogue of the bishops of Porto Rico. We suppose it to be on this account that he has not figured until the present in the various indices and catalogues of the prelates who have governed this diocese.

IV. March, 1572. **Maestro Don Fr. Manuel de Mercado.** Member of the order of St. Jerome. Chosen bishop of Porto Rico and preconized in Rome by Pope St. Pius V, December 15, 1570. Consecrated in Seville. Took possession

of his diocese in March, 1572. Found the island in a great economic crisis, for which he urged reasonable remedies. Severe in ecclesiastical discipline, he put a stop to abuses and corrupt practices which arose during the prolonged inoccupancy of the see which preceded his pontificate. He was trying to group in one town the settlers scattered along the banks of the Coamo, when he was promoted to the see of Panama by the bull of Pope Gregory XIII, granted in the consistory held March 28, 1576, and received in July, 1577.

V. August 17, 1577. **Don Fr. Diego de Salamanca.** Augustinian. Chosen and preconized by Pope Gregory XIII. Took possession of his diocese August 17, 1577, landing at the port of Guánica. Carried out the project of his predecessor, erecting the parish church of Coamo and obtaining in July, 1579, the royal charter of foundation of said town, with the name of San Blas de Illescas. Constructed with his own funds the exterior steps of the cathedral, and established and blessed the cemetery of the cathedral, which existed until 1813 on the present site of the building which the houses of the legislature occupy. Renewed the inquisitorial procedure suppressed during the episcopacies of Bastidas, Carvajal, and Mercado. Resigned the mitre in 1587, and returned to Spain, leaving in Porto Rico a niece whom he brought with him, Doña Ana de Salamanca, married to Juan Ponce de León y Loáisa, great-grandson of the famous conquistador, whereby the succession of this house was continued.

VI. January 12, 1591. **Don Fr. Nicolás de Ramos y Santos.** Franciscan. Born in Villasabariego, near Carrión de los Condes, December 6, 1531. Son of parents of the poorer class, only the precocious intelligence and quite unusual talent of this illustrious prelate could have facilitated his career, and brought about the dignity to which he attained. Student in the college of San Pedro y San Pablo (Alcalá de Henares). While sub-deacon he took the habit at the Franciscan monastery at Valladolid, March 16, 1546. Professed May 17, 1550. Professor of Theology among the religious of his order. Obtained great fame with his work: *Assertionem Veteris Vulgatae Lectionis Juxta Decretum Sacrosancti Concilii Tridentini*, of which part 1 was published in Salamanca in 1576 and part 2 in Valladolid in 1577. His erudite work, *De Regulis Sacrae Scripturae*, proclaims his vast learning. Chosen provincial of La Concepción in 1579, he remained so until 1583. Nominated in May, 1588, by Philip II for the Porto Rican See, chosen and preconized in Rome by Pope Sixtus V, he took possession of his bishopric on January 12, 1591, his jurisdiction being extended as far as Cumaná. As censor of the Holy Office, he renewed the inquisitorial proceedings which his predecessor had begun, but this was the last bishop who exercised the office of Inquisitor in Porto Rico. In 1592 he was promoted to the See of Primate of the Indies, in which he died in 1599. He left written in Porto Rico a few works which the carelessness of men, rather than that of time, has not permitted us to know.

VII. **Dr. Don Antonio Calderón.** Secular priest. Native of Baeza. Archdeacon of Santa Fé de Bogota. Chosen March 5, 1592. Took possession of his diocese in 1593. On his voyage to Porto Rico, the vessel having been boarded by an English corsair off the island of Santa Cruz, he lost the little that he

brought with him. When in November, 1595, this place[1] was attacked by a strong English fleet under the command of the celebrated corsair and admiral, Sir Francis Drake, Bishop Calderón carried out to the full the duties incumbent on him, hastening to most dangerous posts in order to exhort the defenders of the town, and assigning priests to them for divine service. Promoted to the See of Panama, he went to occupy it at the end of 1597, and from there, in 1605, to Santa Cruz de la Sierra, in the viceroyalty of Peru, where he died.

VIII. September 5, 1600. **Don Fr. Martin Vásquez de Arce.** Dominican. Native of Cuzco. Nephew of Rodrigo Vásquez de Arce, president of the royal council of Castile. Student and rector of the College of San Tomás, Seville, where he was when the bishopric was conferred upon him. Entered into his episcopate on Margarita Island, September 5, 1600, and from there proceeded to this cathedral (San Juan) in 1603. Died January 13, 1609, leaving his estate (20,000 ducats) to the church. Buried under the main altar of the cathedral, on the epistle side. If Bastidas was not the first American bishop, as contemporary documents state and Brau denies, certainly Bishop Vásquez de Arce, born in the ancient capital of the Incas, emperors of Peru, was the first American bishop of Porto Rico.

IX. **Don Fr. Alonso de Monroy.** Of the Order of Mercy. Provincial of his order in Spain, was chosen by Pope Paul V, and consecrated Bishop of Porto Rico; but he was unwilling to come to his bishopric. Died in Seville and was buried in the Convent of Mercy. In the epitaph of his tomb one reads that he was chosen Bishop of Porto Rico.

X. 1610. **Maestro Don Fr. Francisco Díaz de Cabrera y Cordóva.** Dominican. Native of Córdoba, of the illustrious line of Díaz de Cabrera, a distinguished branch of the Ponce de Cabrera family, of Córdoba; second son of Don Baltasar Díaz de Cabrera y Córdoba, eleventh Lord of the House, Castles, and Properties of Torres Cabrera, and of Doña Catalina de Corral y Frías; brother, therefore, of Don Alonso, the first-born of the House, of His Majesty's Council; and brother likewise of Don Fernando, gentleman in waiting and governor of the estates of Flanders. Monk of Santa María del Monte, on the outskirts of Córdoba. Chosen and preconized in Rome by Pope Paul V. for the Porto Rican See, he took possession of it in 1610. Promoted to the See of Trujillo, he left to occupy it in 1613.

XI. 1615. **Maestro Don Fr. Pedro de Solier y Vargas.** Augustinian. Native of the village of Barajas, in the archdiocese of Toedo, where he was born in 1574, the son of Pedro Solier de Reinosa and Doña Ynés de Vargas; descendant of Mosen Arnaldo de Solier, a French knight, who was created a grandee of Castile by the king Don Enrique II, and also descendant of the famous Jofre de Loáiza, conqueror of Córdoba. He professed in Salamanca February 13, 1594. Went to the Philippines in 1598. Expounded theology in Manila in 1603. Returned to Spain as Commissary-Procurator of the province, being made "maestro"; nominated by Felipe III for Bishop of Porto Rico, and chosen and preconized in Rome by His Holiness Paul V, November 17, 1614. Took

[1] San Juan, Porto Rico.

possession in 1615. Promoted to Archbishop of Santo Domingo by the same Pope in 1619, he died a year after his installation. In his time, September 12, 1615, occurred a terrible hurricane, which destroyed part of the roof of the Cathedral.

XII. 1623. **Dr. Don Bernardo de Balbuena y Villanueva.** Secular priest. Born in Valdepeñas (Ciudad Real) November 20, 1568; his parents were Gregorio de Villanueva and Doña Luisa de Balbuena, distinguished nobility of that place. He placed the maternal family name before the paternal either as just homage of consideration to his uncle and patron, Don Diego de Balbuena, canon of the cathedral of Mexico, or by obligation inherent in an heir in the female line, a frequent occurrence at that time. He went to Mexico at a tender age, and was educated there under the auspices of the aforesaid uncle, with such notable profit, that at the age of sixteen years he won a prize in the great contest held in that city in 1585. He wrote *El Bernardo*, *La Grandeza Mexicana*, and *El Siglo de Oro*[1], which brought him just and merited fame as a poet of the first order and a prose-writer of parts. Obtained the degree of Doctor of Theology in Siguenza in 1608, and that same year was named Abbot of Jamaica, where he remained until 1620, when he was chosen Bishop of Porto Rico by Pope Paul V. Consecrated in Santo Domingo in 1622 by the Most Illustrious Archbishop Don Fr. Pedro de Oviedo, he took possession of his diocese in 1623, in which year he vainly urged the erection of a nunnery for noble and poor young women, daughters and granddaughters of conquistadores, settlers, etc. Two years later he had the great grief of seeing his library and manuscripts destroyed in the sacking and burning of this place by the Dutch under the command of Baldwin Henry in which were destroyed also some of his unpublished works. Died October 11, 1627, leaving to the Church his not inconsiderable fortune, and arranging for his burial in St. Bernard's Chapel of this cathedral, which was to be constructed out of his own funds, and which is today the baptistery.

XIII. **Dr. Don Juan López Agusto de la Marta.** Secular priest. Native of Tenerife, learned and of serious habits, great preacher, rich and generous dean of Mérida, in Yucatan. Prebendary and doctoral canon in Tlaxcala, by competition. The date of his election and that of his coming to Porto Rico are unknown. He gave great alms to the Church and to needy people. In 1633, on his pastoral visit to the outlying parts of his diocese, being on the island of Margarita, he contributed a thousand ducats to help the Franciscans who were trying to establish a monastery on that island. Shortly afterwards he was promoted to the See of Caracas.

XIV. 1636. **Dr. Don Fr. Juan Alonso de Solís y Mendoza.** Carmelite. Native of Salamanca, son of Pedro de Solís and Doña María Feliche de Mendoza,

[1] *El Bernardo* is an epic treatment of the slaughter of Charlemagne's rearguard, under Roland, at Roncesvaux, in which Bernardo del Carpio, a legendary Spanish hero, is the aggressor rather than the Saracens. It ranks with *La Araucana* of Alonso de Ercilla and *La Cristiada* of Diego de Hojeda as the best of the Spanish epics. According to Quintana "no Castilian poet gives so great a margin for reproof and censure, but also perhaps none offers so many occasions for praise and admiration." The unevenness of the poem, its mingling of tiresome prolixity with passages of harmonious beauty, lofty ideas, and real poetic feeling, is due to the youth of the poet. *La Grandeza Mexicana* describes the times of the conquistadores; *El Siglo de oro en las selvas de Erífile* is a pastoral poem. (*Translator.*)

Señores de Cemprón, Retortillo, y la Granja, of the highest nobility of that city, whom he succeeded in their estates. Councillor of Salamanca, he married in 1593 Doña María Manrique de Lara, daughter of the Señor de las Amarjuelas, Don Bernardino Manrique de Lara. He became a widower in 1606, two daughters, Doña Feliche and Doña María, being left to him. He then renounced his estates and the world, and took the Carmelite habit at San Andrés. He was Master in Theology, preacher and definer of his province, and prior in the monastery of San Silvestre, of Ávila. Chosen and preconized at Rome by Pope Urban VIII in 1636, he took possession of his diocese in the same year, finding on the island, as governor, his nephew Don Iñigo de la Mota y Sarmiento, Knight of Santiago. He was so industrious that in the pastoral visit that he made to the outlying parts of his diocese he personally baptized more than ten thousand Indians. He died April 19, 1641, leaving his property to the Church. He was buried in the Cathedral of this city (San Juan) in the main altar and on the Gospel side, where his nephew, the governor, Don Iñigo de la Mota y Sarmiento, dedicated a slab to his memory, with a beautiful inscription in Latin.

XV. June 13, 1644. **Don Fr. Damián López de Haro y Vallalda.** Trinitarian. Native of Toledo, in whose cathedral he was baptized September 27, 1581, son of Antonio López de Haro and Doña Catalina de Valladolid. Professed in Toledo February 28, 1599, having studied there Grammar and Philosophy, and in Salamanca Sacred Theology, as a result of which he came to be an eminent theologian and professor of ecclesiastical sciences. Ministered in the monasteries of la Guardia, Zamora, Arévalo, Cuenca, Talavera and (twice) in Madrid. Visitador (inspector) in Andalusia; provincial of Castile, Leon, and Navarre, and definer of the last. The city and ecclesiastical chapter of Zamora drew up a petition to Philip IV, urging his nomination for bishop of that diocese, but His Majesty named him for that of Porto Rico; he was preconized February 9, 1644, and consecrated in the church of the Trinitarians in Madrid five days later. Arrived in Porto Rico and took possession of his diocese June 13, 1644. Held Synod in his cathedral Sunday, April 30, 1645, adopting measures to correct abuses, reform manners, and stimulate piety; and finished this synod, which was the second held in Porto Rico, May 2, it being approved by their Majesties Sept. 5 of the same year. Constructor and restorer, he erected anew the episcopal edifice, which was then in the street of San José, adjoining the cathedral, and which had been burned by the Dutch in 1625. He made his pastoral visit not only to the parishes of the island, but also to those of the annexes; and being in the island of Margarita, in August, 1648, attending with charitable solicitude those attacked by the pest which at that time overran these islands and had made 600 victims in Porto Rico, he died in the aforesaid month and year, honored by the esteem and affection of his people.

XVI. **Don Fr. Hernando de Lobo Castrillo.** Franciscan. Chosen and preconized by Pope Innocent X, he took possession of his diocese in 1650. No other data is available on this prelate, except that he died in Porto Rico on October 18, 1651, being buried in his cathedral.

XVII. July 3, 1654. **Maestro Don Fr. Francisco Naranjo.** Dominican. Was in Mexico when he was chosen by Pope Innocent X, on September 3, 1652, Bishop of Porto Rico, and it was so communicated to the chapter by His Majesty in a letter of that date. On July 3, 1654, in the name and by authority of said bishop, who was still in Mexico, Canon Don Diego de Torres y Vargas, professor and vicar-general of the diocese, took possession of it. The bishop did not come. He died in Mexico October 18, 1655, news of his death reaching Porto Rico March 31, 1656, whereupon on the same day Torres Vargas presented his resignation as governor of the bishopric, but the chapter reelected him immediately.

XVIII. May 30, 1659. **Don Francisco Arnaldo de Issasi.** Chosen by Pope Innocent X, December 25, 1657. Took possession of the mitre through his representative, the Licentiate Don José de Bilbao y Bracamonte, on February 25, 1659, and personally on his arrival May 30 following. By his exaggerated punctiliousness in matters of ritual and etiquette on the stated feasts, he caused the people, following the governor, Don José de Novas y Moscoso, to abandon the church on said feasts, the preachers not having anyone to whom to address their sermons. He died April 4, 1651.

XIX. **Dr. Don Manuel de Molinedo.** Chosen Bishop of Porto Rico by Pope Innocent X, in 1663, but did not come to his bishopric, thereby continuing the ecclesiastical government of this diocese in charge of the dean, Don Diego de Torres y Vargas Zapata, elected by the chapter on April 4, 1661.

XX. June 21, 1664. **Don Fr. Benito de Rivas.** Benedictine, of the monastery of San Pedro de Cerdeña. Chosen and preconized by Pope Innocent X June 4, 1663, he took possession of his diocese June 21, 1664. He brought to his cathedral precious relics of the martyrs of Cerdeña, which are preserved to this day in his reliquary, and to which he dedicated a chapel which he had built in the cathedral. On the twentieth of September, 1665, on absenting himself for his pastoral visit, he named as ecclesiastical governor the dean, Don Diego de Torres y Vargas. He died August 27, 1668.

XXI. April 27, 1671. **Don Fr. Bartolomé García de Escañuela.** Franciscan. Chosen by Pope Clement X, he authorized the president of the ecclesiastical chapter of the diocese to take possession of the See in his name, which was done on April 27, 1671, and later personally took possession on August 24, 1673. He ordered the taking of a statistical census of the diocese, which is the only one that we possess of the XVIIth century, and which the parish priest Don Juan Guilarte de Salazar carried out by his command. Promoted to the See of Durango, in Mexico, during his absence the ecclesiastical chapter, having received official news of the appointment, declared this bishopric a vacant See June 5, 1676.

XXII. February 20, 1679. **Dr. Don Marcos Arista de Sobremonte.** Secular priest. Native of Caracas. Chosen by Pope Innocent XI, the dean, Don Luis Muriel y Castro, took possession in his name and by his order February 20, 1679. On January 24, 1680 he gave to the chapter statutes of his own, obliging all to a strict fulfilment of their duties. Died at Cumaná August 10,

1681; but because of lack of news, the See was not declared vacant until May 6, 1682, the chapter electing as governor of the diocese, Archdeacon Don Cristóbal de Pastrana.

XXIII. June 23, 1684. **Don Fr. Francisco de Padilla.** Mendicant. Native of Peru. Took possession June 23, 1684. Vigorous, upright, brilliant, charitable, he cast out of the cathedral church the inappropriate mulatto dancing choirboys, who profaned that holy place. Handled the church funds with extreme exactness; arranged the ritual of the feasts and holy offices in conformity with the sacred canons; and in 1690, because of a horrible epidemic of African smallpox, which cut off a great number of lives, he established in his house a free apothecary's shop and provided food for the needy, going in person to the aid of the dying when the number of priests was diminished by the pest. Promoted to the See of Santa Cruz de la Sierra, in his native land, the See was declared vacant May 5, 1695, and on May 7 the precentor, Dr. Don Martín Calderón de la Barca y Quijano, was elected capitulary vicar.

XXIV. **Don Fr. Bartolomé García.** Chosen Bishop of Porto Rico by Pope Innocent XII in 1696, he did not reach his bishopric; the vicar, Dr. Don Martín Calderón de la Barca, who had been promoted to the archdeaconship, continued to govern the diocese from September 13 of that year.

XXV. **Maestro Don Fr. Gerónimo Valdés.** Basilian monk. Native of Gerona. Chosen Bishop of Porto Rico, but before taking possession was promoted to the See of Santiago de Cuba, and consecrated in Madrid December 23, 1705; arrived in Baracoa in 1706. Died in Havana March 29, 1729, at the age of eighty-three years.

XXVI. **Don Fr. Urbano López.** Trinitarian. Bishop of Porto Rico, he resigned the bishopric without going to the diocese.

XXVII. May 19, 1706. **Don Fr. Pedro de la Concepción Urtiaga y Salazar.** Franciscan. Native of Querétaro, in the vice-royalty of New Spain. Chosen Bishop of Porto Rico by Pope Clement XI, he was consecrated in his native land, where he remained some time without being able to come to his diocese. Took possession May 19, 1706. He issued the penalty of excommunication against those who, under the pretext of amusements and horse-races on the feasts of Saint John and Saint James, committed scandalous and demoralizing excesses. Drew up constitutions, and established a conciliar college in the Hospital of la Concepción, but it did not have success. Held a diocesan synod in his cathedral June 18, 1713, the third celebrated in Porto Rico; but doubtless did not publish the synodal report, and it is not known what was agreed in it, nor if it was approved by His Majesty, as that of López de Haro was. This bishop, energetic, industrious, and intelligent, died in his diocese in 1713, and is buried with the other bishops in the cathedral.

XXVIII. **Don Fr. Raimundo Caballero.** Cistercian Benedictine. Came to Porto Rico, and died within two or three months, without being consecrated.

XXIX. June, 1719. **Dr. Maestro Don Fr. Fernando de Valdivia y Mendoza.** Augustinian. Chosen by Pope Clement XI. Came to Porto Rico and took possession of his diocese in June, 1719. Defended and protected, as

Bishop Urtiaga had done, Captain Henríquez, iniquitously persecuted by the governor, *ad interim*, Dario Granados, in conspiracy with the treasurer Pozo, whom the bishop accused before His Majesty. This virtuous prelate died on on Sunday, November 25, 1725, Dr. Don Martín Calderón de la Barca y Quijano, dean, qualifier of the Holy Office, purveyor, and vicar-general, remaining as governor of the diocese as a vacant See.

XXX. August, 1728. **Don Fr. Sebastián Lorenzo Pizarro.** Basilian monk. Chosen by Pope Benedict XIII. Took possession in August, 1728. He was the first bishop who in his visit to the provinces reached the Orinoco, where the natives, Carib Indians, had killed a French bishop who tried to establish himself among them. He purchased of Doña María de Amézquita y Ayala the houses where he built the episcopal palace, and went to live in it in 1733, a decision which His Majesty approved by royal cedula of November 1, 1738, devolving after his death, which occurred July 23, 1736; Don Juan Lorenzo de Matos, purveyor and vicar-general, commissary of the Holy Crusade, remaining as governor of the diocese as a vacant See.

XXXI. 1738. **Don Fr. Francisco Pérez Lozano.** Basilian monk. Chosen by Pope Clement XII. Entered Porto Rico in the year 1738. Went to Caracas to be consecrated, and afterwards made a visit to the provinces. Died on the island of Trinidad before returning from his consecration; and Canon Don Francisco Martínez, named provisory judge and vicar-general by the ecclesiastical chapter as soon as it had word of the death of Bishop Pérez Lozano, which occurred in 1741, remained as governor of the diocese as a vacant See.

XXXII. April, 1745. **Don Fr. Francisco Plácido de Bejar y Segura.** Basilian monk. Chosen and preconized in Rome by Pope Benedict XIV, he took possession of his diocese in April, 1745, and after great disappointments, caused by a brother, he died two months later, without having been consecrated, June 24 of the same year, being buried in the sacristy of the main chapel of his cathedral.

XXXIII. **Don José Martínez.** Secular priest. Canon of Caracas. Chosen Bishop of Porto Rico by Pope Benedict XIV, he did not accept the charge.

XXXIV. December 18, 1749. **Don Francisco Julián de Antolino.** Secular priest. Prebendary of Palencia. Chosen Bishop of Porto Rico by Pope Benedict XIV he took possession of his diocese December 18, 1749. Promoted to the diocese of Santa Ana, in Venezuela, in March, 1753.

XXXV. **Don Pedro Martínez de Óneca.** Secular priest. Native of Gallipienzo in the valley of Aibar, in Navarre. Chosen January 7, 1756. Visited the whole diocese. In his zeal to elevate morals and defend the humble, he overstepped the limits marked by the royal patronage of the Indies, and as the governor, Guazo, firmly maintained his prerogatives, the bishop excommunicated him: an extreme measure, which would have brought serious consequences, had not both contenders died, Bishop Óneca on April 22, 1760.

XXXVI. 1762. **Don Mariano Martí.** Secular priest. Native of Catalonia. Chosen by Pope Clement XIII, he took possession of his bishopric in 1762. Visited the whole diocese. Greatly improved the cathedral, in which

he built the finest chapel. Consecrated in the latter the Bishop of Comayagua. Was very zealous for ecclesiastical discipline, and a lover of the poor. Was promoted to Caracas, where he died Feb. 20, 1792, the precentor Don José Maysonet remaining as capitular vicar in the vacant See.

XXXVII. **Don José Duarte.** Chosen Bishop of Porto Rico, he died without coming to his diocese, which the aforesaid precentor Don José Maysonet continued to govern, as a vacant See.

XXXVIII. May 25, 1772. **Don Fr. Manuel Jiménez Pérez.** Benedictine monk, of the monastery of Santa María la Real of Nájera. Native of the village of Soto, in la Rioja. Chosen by Pope Clement XIV in 1770, the ecclesiastical chapter was informed of it on February 14, 1771. He reached Porto Rico May 25, 1772, and took possession of his cathedral on the first of June following. He made his pastoral visit to the adjunct islands and provinces as far as the upper Orinoco; gave many ornaments, chalices, and other alms for monasteries and for repairing different churches; erected many parishes; built at his own expense and endowed the Hospital of Our Lady of the Conception, with a capacity of five hundred beds for as many patients; rebuilt the episcopal palace which had been in ruins for many years; visited a second time the churches of the island and had missions preached every year for all the towns of his widespread diocese; suffered with admirable mildness and constancy persecutions and opposition in order to protect the poor and to lessen concubinage and scandals. He was affable with all, humble and modest in his mien; he never left off the habit and way of life of the cloister, practicing the same observance as if he lived in it. On Sunday of each week he sent all the money that there was in his palace to the charities which he designated, leaving most of the time not even the bare necessities for his house to eat the following day. He died August 20, 1781, and was buried in the presbytery of the cathedral. There is extant an oil painting of him, made by the Porto Rican painter, José Campeche.

XXXIX. August 30, 1785. **Dr. Don Felipe José de Trespalacios y Verdeja.** Secular priest. Native of Avilés. Chosen by Pope Pius VI on June 25, 1784, and consecrated in the cathedral of Santo Domingo. Took possession of the See August 30, 1785. Consecrated in his cathedral, in August, 1788, the illustrious Fr. Fernando de Cadiñana. Occupied his See until 1789, when he went to the island of Cuba, where he died October 16, 1799, being the first bishop of the new See of Havana.

XL. July 11, 1790. **Dr. Don Francisco de la Cuerda.** Secular priest. Chosen Bishop of Porto Rico by Pope Clement VI, he took possession July 11, 1790. Consecrated, on May 27, 1792, the bishop-elect of Guiana, Dr. Don Francisco de Ibarra, and on December 22 of the same year, the Most Illustrious Sr. Don Remigio de la Santa. Proposed a geographical plan of the island, indicating the best sites for founding towns and churches. He wished to make the church of Santa Ana into a parish. In May (according to Brau on June 1) of 1795, he resigned his bishopric.

XLI. March 30, 1796. **Don Fr. Juan Bautista de Zengotita y Bengoa.** Mendicant. Native of Berriz, in Vizcaya. Chosen by Pope Sixtus VI on June

2, 1795, and consecrated in Madrid November 14 of the same year, he took possession of his See on March 30, 1796. To him fell the lot of witnessing and contributing to the glorious defense of Porto Rico, attacked in April and May, 1797, by an English army under the command of Lord Ralph Abercromby, and by a fleet of sixty vessels commanded by Sir Henry Hawey. Died November 1, 1802, being buried in his cathedral in the chapel of St. John Nepocumene, today the chapel of Jesus the Nazarene; the dean Don Juan Lorenzo de Matos Colón, provisory judge and vicar-general of the diocese, remaining as governor of the See.

XLII. July 27, 1803. **Dr. Don Juan Alejo de Arizmendi y de la Torre.** Secular priest. Native of San Juan de Puerto Rico. The first, and until the present, the only Porto Rican who has enjoyed this dignity in his native land. Born July 17, 1757. Son of Don Miguel Antonio de Arizmendi, Regidor Perpétuo (life councillor) of this city (San Juan), and of Doña Juana Isabel de la Torre y de Castro, of the most ancient and distinguished nobility of Porto Rico. Studied theology and canon law in the University of Caracas, where Bishop Don Mariano Martí, who had been bishop of this diocese (XXXVI) ordained him as deacon. Received the priesthood in Santo Domingo, capital of Hispaniola, at the hands of the bishop-elect of Porto Rico, Dr. Don Felipe José de Trespalacios (XXXIX), who had gone to that cathedral to be consecrated, and accompanied the bishop on his voyage to Porto Rico, being shipwrecked off the shores of Arecibo July 16, 1785. Confessor and director of the Carmelite nuns. Bishop Don Francisco de la Cuerda (XL) named him purveyor and vicar-general of the diocese. Without his asking it and without consulting his wishes, he was recommended by His Majesty to Pope Pius VII for the episcopate of this island on March 13, 1803, and having been appointed and preconized in Rome as Bishop of Porto Rico, was consecrated in the cathedral of Caracas, taking possession of his diocese on July 27, 1803, amid the enthusiasm and congratulations of his fellow-countrymen. This worthy prelate was simple, modest, and amiable; he maintained with firm hand ecclesiastical discipline and morals, of which he himself had always given the highest example. He bought with certain church revenues and with his private funds the large plot where the Conciliar Seminary is, in order to devote it to this end, and seconding the initiative of Bishop Zengotita (XLI), zealously undertook the establishment and construction of the said seminary, a noble plan which his early death prevented him from seeing realized, and which remained suspended until the time of Bishop Gutiérrez de Cos, who was able to finish it. This virtuous prelate had the sad prevision of his own death; on taking leave of the cathedral clergy, to go up to the island on his pastoral visit (September 6, 1812), he said with emotion, "until we meet in the Vale of Jehosaphat." After going over almost all of the island, he fell ill at Hormigueros, in whose modest hermitage he always desired to be buried, but his friends wished to bring him to his palace, which his grave state of health did not permit; he died at Arecibo on October 12, 1814, being buried provisionally in the hermitage of Monserrate. The following year (March 31, 1815), his remains were translated, to be buried permanently in

his cathedral, in the chapel of St. Bernard, today the baptistery, where they still rest. The slab which covers his mortal remains bears the following epitaph: *Hic, Amabilis, Religiosus, Integer, Zelotipus, Misericors, Eruditus, Novator, Decoratus, Impigerque, Primus, Antistes, Patrius, Jacet. R. I. P.* To govern the diocese as vacant See the chapter named the licentiate Don Nicolás Alonso de Andrade y San Juan, precentor, purveyor, and vicar-general.

XLIII. February 16, 1817. **Dr. Don Mariano Rodríguez de Olmedo y Valle.** Secular priest. Native of Guancargui, in Peru. Nominated by His Majesty for bishop of this diocese on May 21, 1815, and consecrated in Madrid August 4, 1816. In consequence of a decree of the Cortes of December 12, 1820, he resigned the bishopric, and had to pass to the island of Santo Domingo, Dr. Don Manuel Joaquín Santaella, canon, purveyor, and capitular vicar, remaining as governor of the diocese as vacant see until April 25, 1823, when the precentor Dr. Don José Lorenzo Rendón was elected for the said charge. With the triumph of the absolute regime Dr. Don Mariano Rodríguez de Olmedo y Valle recovered his bishopric, and again took possession of his see December 4, 1823. Promoted to the archbishopric of Cuba by royal decree of October 8, 1824, he named as ecclesiastical governor Dr. Andrade (October 31, 1824), and left for his new diocese. On May 17, 1825, Dr. Andrade handed over his jurisdiction to Dr. Gutiérrez de Arroyo, archdeacon, but the diocese having been declared vacant by royal decree of July 20, on account of approval having been given to the archiepiscopal bulls of Olmedo, Dr. Don Nicolás Alonso de Andrade y San Juan was named definitively as ecclesiastical governor, purveyor and capitulary vicar on September 9.

XLIV. July 18, 1826. **Dr. Don Pedro Gutiérrez y Cos.** Secular priest. Native of the city of Piura in Peru, where he was born October 24, 1750. Appointed and preconized as Bishop of Porto Rico by Pope Leo XII in June 1826, he took possession of his diocese July 18 of the same year. He finished the construction of the Seminary and opened it on October 12, 1832, the establishment of which, solicited from 1712 by Bishop Urtiaga, obstructed then by the military government, and zealously undertaken by Bishops Zengotita and Arizmendi, especially by the latter, was to lead to the inclusion in its professorial halls of such competent and venerable teachers as Fr. Ángel de la Concepción Vázquez, native of Juncos, and Dr. Don Juan Francisco Jiménez, of Cabo Rojo. This good bishop died April 9, 1833, Dr. Don Nicholás Alonso de Andrade y San Juan remaining as ecclesiastical governor, purveyor, and vicar-general of the vacant See.

XLV. **Dr. Don Miguel Laborda y Galindo.** Secular priest. Canon of Zaragoza. Appointed Bishop of Porto Rico by His Holiness Gregory XVI in 1833. This bishop, like several others, did not take possession of his diocese, but it is not just that on that account the ecclesiastical chronicles should be silent concerning him, and that his name should not figure in catalogues of the prelates of Porto Rico; with all the more reason as he left a generous and charitable trace of his election to this diocese, the equal of which is not to be found among the other bishops-elect who did not occupy their Sees; he bequeathed to

twelve poor men and twelve poor women of this city 3,840 reales, which were distributed fittingly, according to the accounts of those favored, of which there is evidence under date of November 14, 1870 in the capitulary archives. Doctor Andrade continued as ecclesiastical governor until his death on August 21, 1845, when he was succeeded by Dr. Don Juan Francisco Jiménez.

XLVI. December 31, 1846. **Don Fr. Francisco de la Puente.** Dominican. Native of Saldaña, in Old Castile, where he was born April 2, 1779. Appointed Bishop of Porto Rico by Pope Gregory XVI, he was consecrated in Madrid October 28, 1846. He reached Porto Rico December 31 of the same year, but did not take possession until January 5, 1847. The illnesses which he suffered in this island obliged him to obtain permission to go to Spain, where he arranged his transfer to the See of Segovia (1848) where he died in 1854. After his transfer the licentiate Don Dionisio González de Mendoza remained as ecclesiastical governor and capitulary vicar in the vacant see.

XLVII. February 10, 1849. **Dr. Don Gil Esteve y Tomás.** Secular priest. Native of Torá, in Catalonia, where he was born December 16, 1798. Appointed and preconized in Rome as Bishop of Porto Rico by Pope Pius IX on July 3, 1848. Consecrated in Tarragona October 8 of the same year, he reached Porto Rico February 10, 1849. He governed this diocese until the second of August, 1853, when he went by permission to the Peninsula, leaving as ecclesiastical governor Father Don José Oriol y Costa, who governed until May 16, 1855, when the chapter elected Dr. Don Gerónimo Mariano Usera y Alarcón. While in Spain, Bishop Gil Esteve was promoted to the See of Terranova, where he died in 1858. In the meantime, by royal order received August 4, 1855, this diocese was declared a vacant See and the licentiate Don Dionisio González de Mendoza was elected to govern it, which he did until January 8, 1856, when Dr. Don Gerónimo Mariano Usera y Alarcón, dean of the cathedral, was named, who governed it until August 5, 1856, on which date he was succeeded in said government by the very intelligent Dr. Don Antonio Cerezano, who figured later with such honor in the cathedral of Santo Domingo. Bishop Gil Esteve in his short episcopate showed his capacity, his industry, and his virtue. He reorganized the seminary, obtaining by royal decree of May 2, 1851 the right to confer the degree of Bachelor in Philosophy, created special chairs, and chose excellent professors, as a result of which this seminary rose to the highest standing among the teaching centers of the whole island. He reconstructed in great part the cathedral and the episcopal palace, and edited a catechism of Christian doctrine which for many years was the textbook throughout the island.

XLVIII. May 27, 1857. **Don Fr. Pablo Benigno Carrión de Málaga.** Capuchin monk. Native of Málaga, where he was born February 13, 1798. Son of Don José Carrión and Doña María de Luna, both of the noblest stock of that city, and, on the paternal side, of naval ancestry, a career which this great bishop of Porto Rico was to follow in his youth, and whose showy uniform he exchanged, by an irresistible vocation, for the coarse wool of the sons of St. Francis, receiving the habit on October 5, 1816, and professing on the sixth of the same month, taking the name of Pablo. Confessor of the auxiliary bishop of Santiago in Galicia. Master of novices in Seville. In compliance with the desires of his

younger sister, who was married in Porto Rico, he transferred his residence here, reaching the island on February 18, 1842. Named priest administrator and coadjutor of the parish of San Germán. Rector of the Conciliar Seminary, he obtained by royal order the academic validity of the degrees of Bachelor of Arts which the seminary conferred. He resigned the rectorship and requested the parish of Vieques as a kind of retirement, to which his heart, made for the cloister, aspired. Designated for the mitre of Porto Rico by his predecessor, Bishop Gil Esteve, against his will and solely through obedience he accepted the appointment as Bishop of Porto Rico. Nominated by Her Majesty Isabel II, and appointed and preconized in Rome by Pope Pius IX on December 21, 1857, he was consecrated in Madrid in the royal chapel on March 7, 1858, his patroness being the queen herself, by whom all the expenses were borne. Arrived in Porto Rico May 27, 1858, in the steamship *Almogaver*. Dr. Father Don Diego de Alba had already taken possession in his name and by his order on the tenth of the same month. He brought the Jesuits to Porto Rico, to whom he entrusted the seminary and the Church of San José. On July 20 he blessed the recently constructed church of the Carmelite Sisters; on the twenty-second he declared abolished the old dependent parish of the chapter, and in its place created another which was to function independently of the chapter, although with the same name and appellation, and at the same time erected the new parish of St. Francis in the church and former monastery of the Franciscans. In December, 1862, he proposed the acquisition of the present beautiful pavement of the cathedral. On June 19, 1863, he presented to the cathedral the statue of St. John the Baptist, which he sent for from Spain, and brought from Spain in the same year the Sisters of Charity, who have rendered such useful services.

In August, 1865, he founded with his own funds the Infant Asylum, to which he donated, as a holy relic, the head of St. Marianus; previously he had sent to the cathedral the body of St. Pius, martyr, which he brought from Rome and had obtained from Pope Pius IX. On November 5, 1865 having finished the work of restoration of the Cathedral Church, he was consecrated with due solemnity. In September, 1869, he attended the Ecumenical Council at the Vatican as representative of his diocese. Orator, academician (active member) of the Royal Academy of Belles Lettres (Buenas Letras), Knight Grand Cross of Isabel the Catholic, and Archbishop-elect of Santiago de Cuba, which he did not accept. He had a tragic end, dying as a result of the overturning of the carriage in which he was riding, on his last pastoral visit, while leaving Fajardo for Luquillo, on November 29, 1871. His body was brought to this city and received burial in the crypt of the bishops in the Chapel of Providence.

XLIX. March 5, 1875. **Don Fr. Juan Antonio Puig y Monserrat.** Franciscan. Native of Felanitz, in the island of Mallorca, where he was born July 20, 1813. Received orders and professed in his order by the year 1823, and came to Porto Rico, fixing his residence in Ponce, by 1840, founding there an excellent primary school and some classes of secondary education, which had great success in that vicinity. He personally acquired universal sympathy on account of his affable character. He later traveled in Europe and the United States, perfecting himself in the knowledge of the French and English languages.

He was later pastor in Patillas, Juana Díaz, and Aguadilla, and in 1861 was named parish priest of Our Lady of Los Remedios. In 1869 he was elect-deputy to the Cortes for the district of the capital city by the votes of the Conservative party. His old friendship with General Prim obtained for him the nomination for Bishop of Porto Rico, and he was preconized on January 16, 1874. He took possession March 5, 1875, and during his episcopacy occupied himself with a strong hand with ecclesiastical discipline. He was faithful to friendships, simple and plain in his dealings, very generous, and this caused him to be badly deceived by subordinates. He died January 2, 1894 and is buried in the crypt of the bishops of Porto Rico, in the Chapel of Providence.

L. November 11, 1894. **Don Fr. Toribio Minguella de la Merced.** Augustinian. Native of Igea de Cornago, in Logroño, where he was born in April, 1836. In 1854 he took the habit of his order and in 1859 he was ordained priest. He was sent to the Philippines by his superiors; discharged important offices as parochial commissary, provincial vicar, rector of the college of San Millán de la Cogulla, definitor, voting prior, and chronicle of his order. In May, 1894, he was proposed by Her Majesty for the See of Porto Rico, and having been preconized by His Holiness Leo XIII, he received consecration on August 5 of the same year, and took possession of his diocese November 11. On March 24, 1898, he was preconized Bishop of Siguenza, taking possession on June 13 following. A man of extraordinary talent and vast learning, he enjoyed fame as a savant, no less than as an eloquent sacred orator. His numerous scientific and literary works, as well as his pastorals, full of evangelical unction, testify to his piety and wisdom.

LI. **Don Fr. Francisco J. Valdés.** Augustinian. Native of Asturias. Named in 1897, he resigned without taking possession on account of the change in national sovereignty of the island (Spanish-American War).

LII. December 20, 1899. **Dr. James Humbert Blenk, S. M.** Native of Neustadt, kingdom of Bavaria, where he was born July 28, 1856, the son of James Blenk and Catherine Wigman, Protestants, in which communion they remained until their death. He was the youngest of seventeen children and a twin, but his twin brother died at six months. This German family migrated to New Orleans, and there the boy, James, surrounded by Catholic influences, and himself of a mystic, though practical temperament, adopted the Catholic religion, and with such fervor, that he entered the ecclesiastical state with an irresistible and devout inclination. He was baptized at twelve years of age, and later entered the Redemptorist Order. He studied at Charlewix, Mich. The Marist Fathers, whose order he had entered, sent him to France to make his novitiate, and afterwards to the Catholic University of Ireland. On August 16, 1885 he was ordained priest by Archbishop Redwood, New Zealand, a notable Marist, and was assigned to Louisiana. As professor in Jefferson College he excelled in such a noteworthy way that he was named president of the college in 1891. He was named for various and delicate missions in France, England, and Ireland. In February, 1897, he was named pastor of the parish of the Name of Mary, in Algiers. When Monsignor Chapelle was named Apostolic Delegate of Cuba and Porto Rico, he named

Fr. Blenk as auditor of the delegation, and later recommended him as Bishop of Porto Rico, as the man called by his talent and ability to discharge such an honorable, and in those days so difficult a, task. Appointed for this diocese, he was consecrated on July 2, 1899, and took possession on December 20. He worked consistently to rescue his diocese from the pitiable state into which the change of sovereignty had plunged it. The island had been swept by a hurricane, which had caused terrible damage; by great patience he collected $30,000 to relieve the needy poor. In his time the lawsuit of the Church with the State over the properties of the Church usurped by the government was settled favorably, and thus he raised funds with which he made headway against the great expenses which they had caused. Among the many good things which he did, there are two, however, which have lent themselves to various interpretations and commentaries, although somewhat unjust. One is the removal of the Carmelite nuns to San Germán, but this is explained by the ruined state of their convent; and the other is the suppression of the seminary, which, however, the lack of resources for its maintenance, and the small number of seminarians, which then existed, etc., might justify. This good prelate, a linguist par excellence, had a good command of the Spanish language, and delivered sermons in that language with relative ease. When Archbishop Chapelle of New Orleans died, he was promoted to that diocese, and left Porto Rico April 20, 1906, leaving in the island a most pleasant impression of his episcopate because of his virtues, his talent, and his amiability, and his transfer was deeply regretted, although there was sincere joy over his deserved promotion. He died in New Orleans April 20, 1917.

LIII. March 6, 1907. **Dr Don. Guillermo Ambrosio Jones y Hurley.** Augustinian. Native of Cambridge, New York, U. S. A., where he was born July 21, 1865, son of Mr. Thomas Jones and Mrs. Mary (Hurley) Jones. Made his special studies at Villanova College, Pennsylvania. Received the priesthood at the hands of the Most Rev. Patrick J. Ryan, Archbishop of Philadelphia, on March 15, 1890. Held the following charges: assistant in St. Augustine's parish, Philadelphia; assistant in St. Nicholas's parish, Atlantic City, N. J.; master of novices of Villanova monastery; rector of the parish of Santo Cristo del Buen Viaje, Havana, Cuba; president of St. Augustine's College, Havana, Cuba, where he was when he was appointed and preconized in Rome by Pope Pius X as Bishop of Porto Rico, on January 12, 1907, and consecrated in the cathedral of Havana by Mgr. José Aversa, Archbishop of Sardés and Apostolic Delegate of Cuba and Porto Rico, assisted by the bishops of Havana and Camaguey, February 24, 1907. He arrived in Porto Rico and took possession of his diocese March 6, 1907. On March 4, 1908, he authorized the transferral of the remains of Juan Ponce de León from the former monastery of St. Thomas Aquinas, today the parish church of San José, to the cathedral, which transfer was carried out August 12, 1908, in solemn procession, by all the city, in symbolical celebration of the fourth centenary of that famous day on which Christian civilization began in Porto Rico. On September 29, 1910, in his cathedral Bishop Mgr. Vuylsteke, Dutch Dominican, appointed to the See of Curaçao was consecrated. The consecration was performed by Archbishop Aversa, who

happened to be in Porto Rico, assisted by Mgr. Jones and Mgr. Berríos. In 1911 the bishop erected as a parish, with the title of San José, the former conventual church of St. Thomas Aquinas. On April 13, 1912 he embarked for New York to join the other pilgrims and travel to Rome to make the visit *ad limina*, which he accomplished with all felicity. He organized the celebration of the Fourth Centenary of the erection of this diocese, the oldest in America, with a magnificent civil-religious festival which began on Wednesday, the nineteenth of February, and ended on Tuesday, the fourth of March, 1913, the following prelates, invited by Bishop Jones, attending: His Eminence Cardinal Farley, Archbishop of New York; His Grace James H. Blenk, Archbishop of New Orleans and former Bishop of Porto Rico; His Excellency Sr. Don Francisco Barnada y Aguilar, Archbishop of Santiago de Cuba; Sr. Don Manuel Ruiz y Rodríguez, Bishop of Pinar del Río; Bishop John Edward Gunn, Bishop of Natchez; Rev. Fr. Tomás Lorente, vice-provincial of the Dominicans of New Orleans; and the suite corresponding to these prelates and high personages of the Catholic Church, who for the first time in the historic life of Porto Rico had been able to meet on this island at such a fortunate moment. On Tuesday, March 25, was erected and blessed by the Bishop the magnificent marble monument installed in the cathedral by the Spanish Club (Casino) of San Juan de Puerto Rico to guard the venerated remains of the conqueror, settler, and first governor of Porto Rico and discoverer and first governor (adelantado) of Florida and Biminí, the illustrious Ponce de Léon. On April 20, 1913, the Bishop blessed and handed over to the Carmelite Sisters of the Convent of San José of this city, who were temporarily in San Germán, their present convent of Santurce, which he had built for them, with all the conveniences and comfort that modern times demand. On May 15, 1913, he consecrated the beautiful Gothic chapel of the College of the Sacred Heart, established in Santurce. He re-established in January, 1915, the seminary suppressed during the previous episcopate, whereby he opened anew the doors of the Church to the sons of the island. Finally, becoming aware of the need of new constitutions by which to regulate this diocese, both because of the time which had passed since the last synod and because the change of sovereignty in Porto Rico implied a complete transformation in the ecclesiastical order, he conceived the idea of holding a diocesan synod, which was realized with all felicity and with the greatest success during the ninth, tenth, eleventh and twelfth of January of the present year (1917). This synod will fix for a long time the regimen which is to preside over all the acts of the ecclesiastical life of the diocese. This great prelate, who to his great intelligence and industry adds the most fortunate aptitude for economic questions, increased and assured the revenues of the Church which are rather slender in Porto Rico, and he has been able to arrange the income and expenditures in such a way that not only can all the parishes develop with a certain ease, but also in such a way as to permit him to provide for aged and poor priests, who find the most secure and kindly asylum in his episcopal palace, which has been converted by his noble generosity into the hospice for virtuous and infirm old age.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Virgin Islands of the United States of America. Historical and Descriptive, Commercial and Industrial Facts, Figures, and Resources. By Luther K. Zabriskie, formerly Vice-Consul of the United States of America at St. Thomas. New York: G. P. Putnam and Sons, 1918. Pp. xvii+339.

The former Vice-Consul has written a very pleasing and instructive volume on these much discussed islands. That the purely historical suffers in such close intimacy with the raw facts of imports and exports does not lessen the value of his work. Perhaps unconsciously, Mr. Zabriskie has given us the proper critique of his work in the quotation from Jourdan with which he prefaces his book: "Reader, let this little taste that I have given thee of the Summer Islands satisfie thee for the present . . . Hastie occasione of business doth make me write somewhat hastilie, and leave out many things which were fitte to be spoken of . . .". In spite of the superficial treatment given to the history of the islands, it must be admitted that we have in this volume the "first comprehensive treatise on the Virgin Islands of the United States of America," as the author not unjustly calls his book.

The Danish West Indies passed into the possession of the United States in March, 1917. A farewell Service at the Reformed Dutch Church on Sunday, February 18, 1917, was the requiem of Danish rule, and on Saturday, March 17, the official transfer was made at St. Thomas. The ceremony was somewhat spectacular, but something special was needed to gloss over the crude bargaining of the United States for these islands. The sale was attempted in 1867, but miscarried; forty years later, it failed again. The expression of opinion as given in the newspaper accounts of the day are significant of the public feeling aroused. One editor speaks of the "nightmare" that will no longer disturb them. There is a grim humour in the attitude taken by the United States Government from the day that Seward first proposed the purchase of the islands from Denmark, but the "bargain days in Islands" were over on March 17, 1917, and the many humiliations the American Government had caused came to an end. The Great War was needed to emphasize the necessity of possession. The "Farewell

to Dannebrog . . . Welcome to Old Glory" closed a regime of over two hundred and fifty years. "It is but natural," one observer wrote at the time, "that one's emotions on such an occasion should be stirred to their depths, and as the old flag came down, tears filled the eyes of our women, and strong, robust men shook as the tears rolled down their cheeks—it was a sad sight, cutting to the heart, made more solemn perhaps by the sound of the guns in the Royal salute, while the band played the Danish national anthem. But quickly ran up the Starry Banner, and again the hearts of the people were cheered. In deep hopes for the future they saw the Stars shine out."

The Virgin Islands of the United States of America, as their new official title reads, constitute some fifty or more independent islands. Columbus, we are told, named the islands after St. Ursula and her virgins. Only three of these are of sufficient importance either to the historian or to the commercial traveller. These are St. Thomas, St. John, and St. Croix. The history of Thomas begins with the arrival of Erik Smidt, the Dane, on March 30, 1666. Nearly two hundred years had passed since Columbus had sighted it, but beyond a few carvings on a rock, some stone chisels, and other trivial relics, all trace of the inhabitants up to Smidt's coming had disappeared. In 1701, Father Jean-Baptiste Labat, a Dominican missionary, visited the island, and with his *Nouveau Voyage aux isles Françoises de l'Amérique* (Paris, 1722), our first authentic history of the islands begins. From that date down to the sale, it is a record of great trade, numerous fleets of shipping vessels, colossal fortunes made and lost, and then a long period of lean years, when the beautiful harbor of St. Thomas lay deserted and the town of Charlotte Amalie slumbered, dreaming of the great days that were past. St. Croix is called the Garden of the West Indies. At one time it was the seat of government for the Danish West Indies. Discovered also by Columbus, we hear nothing of the island until 1625, when Dutch and English colonists came to the island. Its history and its fate have been closely identified with those of St. Thomas. The island of St. John was first formally taken possession of by Denmark in 1684, but colonists did not come until 1816, when the first came over from St. Thomas. The population of the three islands amounted in 1911 to 27,086. In 1791, the total population was 31,426, and

in 1835 the number had increased to 43,178. Since that date, a steady decrease in the population has taken place. The religious statistics contains the following figures: English-Episcopal, 9,050; Catholics, 7,369; Moravians, 5,543; Lutherans, 3,206; Methodists, 1,174; other, 744.

The purpose of the purchase can best be told in the report of Vice-Admiral Foster:

> St. Thomas lies right in the track of all vessels from Europe, Brazil, the East Indies, and the Pacific Ocean bound to the West Indian Islands or to the Atlantic States. It is the point where all vessels coming from any of the above stations touch for supplies. It is a central point from which any or all of the West Indian islands can be assailed, while it is impervious to attack from landing parties, and can be fortified to any extent. The bay, on which lies the town of St. Thomas, is almost circular, the entrance being by a neck guarded by two heavy forts, which can be so strengthened and protected that no foreign power can ever hope to take it. St. Thomas is a small Gibraltar of itself and could not be attacked by a naval force. There would be no possibility of landing troops there, as the island is surrounded by reefs and breakers, and every point near which a vessel or boat could approach is a natural fortification and only requires guns, with little labour expended on fortified works. There is no harbour in the West Indies better fitted than St. Thomas for a naval station. Its harbour and that of St. John, and the harbour formed by Water Island, could contain all the vessels of the largest navy in the world, where they would be protected against an enemy. In fine, St. Thomas is the keystone to the arch of the West Indies. It commands them all. It is of more importance to us than to any other nation.

The book contains chapters on Steamer Service between the islands, Harbour Facilities, Imports and Exports, Banks, Currency, Sanitation and Public Works, Agriculture, Sugar Cane, and Manufactures. The last eight chapters deal with the Sale and Transfer of the Islands: "Few sections of the world," says the author, "provide more interesting material for the writing of books, but comparatively little use has been made of this material up to the present time." Mr. Zabriskie has written a very entertaining story out of these materials and has enhanced his book with many photographic illustrations. Here and there in his volume there is a reference to his material, but a list of sources and books for the student would have added value to his work. The historical student hopes that, in Jourdan's phrase, "ere it be long thou shalt have a larger relation thereof."

Santo Domingo: A Country with a Future. By Otto Schoenrich. New York: Macmillan Co., 1918. Pp. xiv+418.

This rather pretentious book with its still more pretentious title: *Santo Domingo, a Country with a Future,* is badly disappointing. Mr. Schoenrich happens to have a personal acquaintance with Dominican affairs "derived from observation on several trips to the Dominican Republic and Haiti, from friendships formed with prominent Dominican families during a residence of many years in Latin America, and from experience as secretary to the special United States Commission to investigate the provincial condition of Santo Domingo in 1905, and as secretary to the Dominican Minister of Finance during the 1906 loan negotiations." This assuredly should have given the author, or rather, traveller, for his volume is written as one describes a country from the foreigner's viewpoint, an intimate and necessarily a sympathetic appreciation of the historical factors in Dominican history. The volume can be divided into two parts: an historical sketch from 1492 down to 1918, consisting of six chapters; and an ethico-social and topographical study in sixteen chapters. The historical sketch is a travesty. War, carnage, revolution, assassination, murder, ecclesiastical chicanery, exploitation of the Indians, and slavery, make up the story's prominent features. We have that elusive character, Father Boil, hurdling through the opening pages, insisting that sanguinary vengeance be taken for stealth on the part of the Indians, and conspiring with de Margarite to overthrow Diego Columbus. There are few words of commendation for anyone. Archbishop Nouel, of Santo Domingo, who became provisional President of the Dominican Republic in 1912, is, however, given credit for singleness of purpose, while in office. This first part of the volume gives the impression that Santo Domingo is a land without a creditable past, and one regrets the narrow view the author takes of its history, and especially of everything connected with the Catholic Church in the island.

This regret is heightened by the fact that the second half of the book is an excellent description of the island. The Dominican Republic is almost as large as New Hampshire and Vermont together, less than half the size of Cuba and more than five times

the size of Porto Rico. The island has never been carefully surveyed, nor have its geological formation and mineral wealth ever been thoroughly studied. The metals found most frequently are gold, copper, iron and coal. Very little mining has been done so far. The United States Commission of Inquiry to Santo Domingo reported in 1871: "The resources of the country are vast and various, and its products may be increased with scarcely any other limit than the labor expended upon them. . . Taken as a whole, this Republic is one of the most fertile regions on the face of the earth. The evidence of men well acquainted with the other West India Islands declares this to be naturally the richest of them all." Despite this, as Mr. Schoenrich points out, the country's wonderful resources are today in almost virgin condition; in the greater part of the Republic they remain untouched, and in the remainder the beginning of development has scarcely been made. Here and there the author spoils his description with facetious scenes: ". . . and at the great Azuta church I found a goat in the vestibule looking reverently in." The claim is made in the chapter on *The People*, that within a decade after its discovery by Columbus, the Spaniards had practically killed off the million natives they found there in 1493. "The vindictive Father Boil," who was "a nuisance," reappears in the chapter on Religion. The Inquisition is likewise brought on the scene, and we are told that "there are in the clerical body a number of black sheep far too fond of the pleasures of the flesh." Father Billini, the Vincent de Paul of Santo Domingo, is given praise that is exceptional in a book of this character. Occasionally statements such as this are met with: "The less educated people of the cities and most of the country people not only hold the priests in great respect, but are blindly superstitious. It is common to find crosses in the courtyards of country houses, placed here to keep evil spirits away. Frequently also, three crosses are seen in conspicuous places near the roadside or even in the middle of the road. They are supposed to propitiate the Almighty, and pious persons mumble prayers as they pass them." Evidently, the author has never travelled in European countries and does not recognize the *Calvaire* or its meaning. He assures us that another peculiarity of Dominican Catholicism is its tolerant attitude towards Freemasonry. "It is not unusual for persons who are recognized as

fervent Catholics to be at the same time enthusiastic masons." These statements can be understood in the light of the author's lack of perspective, and are excusable as evidences of a shallow grasp on his subject; but there can be no legitimate excuse for the assertion that: "As in Spanish colonies, it was not the policy of the Spanish government in Santo Domingo to foster popular education." In the next sentence we are told of the establishment of the University of St. Thomas Aquinas in San Domingo City in 1558. There is a very interesting chapter on *The Remains of Columbus*, and the reader will find here for the first time a complete account of this controversy. The weight of evidence, the author holds, is strongly in favor of the Dominican contention. "It seems that, in spite of the acts of men, fate has permitted the remains of the Discoverer of America to repose in the principal Cathedral of the island he loved."

The author had an unusually attractive theme. He has not succeeded in contributing to the literature on Santo Domingo anything more than an ephemeral description of the people and of their romantic history.

The Life of John Cardinal McCloskey, First Prince of the Church in America, 1810–1885. By His Eminence John Cardinal Farley. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1918. Pp. vii +401.

It is now almost twenty years since the late Cardinal Archbishop of New York published the initial chapters of this Life of America's first Prince of the Church. Since that time, as he tells us in the Preface, the increasing demands of official life left him very little leisure for the work. From 1872 to 1884, the eminent author was Cardinal McCloskey's Secretary, and with true biographical instinct it was his custom during those twelve years to write down with little delay the records of conversations with Cardinal McCloskey and others. The result of this labor of love consists of several well-filled note-books and diaries, all of which were used in this biography. For the part taken by Cardinal McCloskey in the life of the Church in America during the forty years of his episcopate, the author personally searched or had searched the ecclesiastical archives of New York, Baltimore, Albany, Newark, Rochester, and Buffalo. Cardinal McCloskey

preserved very few of his own personal papers and hence the letters and incidents collected by the author have an added value because of their rarity.

The volume is divided into nine chapters, dealing successively with the Cardinal's early years in New York, his student days at Mount St. Mary's and in Rome, his years in the Vineyard of New York, where he was pastor of old St. Joseph's and President of St. John's College, Fordham, his elevation to the coadjutor-bishopric of New York during the middle years of Archbishop Hughes' occupancy of that great See, the seventeen years he spent as first Bishop of Albany, his succession to Archbishop Hughes in 1864, his elevation to the College of Cardinals in 1875, and his death in 1885, with a final chapter devoted to his inner life.

The underlying principles of John McCloskey's life as a boy, a collegian, a seminarian, a priest and bishop, were a loyal attachment to the Church and a childlike love for the Presence of God. His humility was obvious to all except to himself. "His modesty of speech, his benignity of manner, his great personal simplicity of heart, may not be to the eyes of the world," we are told, "the outward dress of a fearless and uncompromising disciplinarian or of a strong masterly personality in affairs of the Church and State. His dislike for public display and his careful avoidance of everything that might bring him before the public gaze are probably the most salient aspects of his character." His retiring disposition, however, did not exclude him from taking a very active part in all the important movements of the Church during those difficult years of reconstruction after the Civil War. He was undoubtedly one of the most prominent figures at the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore in 1866. Although the youngest Archbishop present, he was chosen to preach the opening sermon. Cardinal Gibbons describes the scene in his *Retrospect of Fifty Years* and relates the fact that a few moments before Archbishop McCloskey ascended the pulpit, a telegram was handed to him announcing the destruction of his Cathedral in New York by fire. "His Eminence preached in his usual tranquil and unruffled manner," writes Cardinal Gibbons, "and when I expressed to him the next morning my surprise at his composure, he replied: 'The damage was done, and I could not undo it.' " All the prelates present at the Council regarded Cardinal McCloskey as a man of

uncommon prudence and judgment. Possibly his most far-reaching part in the Council was his appeal for the foundation of the Catholic University of America which came into being a generation later.

It is highly significant of Cardinal McCloskey's independence of thought that he voted *non placet* at the Vatican Council on the question of papal infallibility. He was not opposed to the dogma of infallibility in itself, but declared himself against the expediency of defining it as an article of faith at that time. In speaking of the Vatican Council, Cardinal Gibbons, in his charming frankness of historical narrative, tells us in his *Retrospect:* "Never have I heard such plain speaking in my life; never have I seen men apparently more violently attached to their own opinions, nor less ready to give way to their opponents. There were times, indeed, when the excitement rose to fever heat, and when one was reminded of some of the earlier Councils, as, for instance, the Council of Chalcedon. But all the excitement was but the outward and visible manifestation of the burning zeal within, and when once the decision was taken and the Bull containing it promulgated, not one Bishop of that assembly forsook the See of Peter and the Catholic Church."

Bishop McQuaid, who was proverbially slow to praise, summed up Cardinal McCloskey's life in these words: "He was a prince among princes, a man of learning and of fine parts, and well adapted to smooth over the asperities of the past and quell opposition by the meekness and gentleness of his manner." Cardinal McCloskey occupied the See of New York at a time when the readjustments of life and thought after the Civil War required a most skilful guide and a prudent watcher on the Towers of Israel. His greatest success lay in harmonizing factors which threatened even then to become unmanageable and which indeed cast many shadows of unhappiness over the episcopate of his successor, Michael Augustine Corrigan.

The volume is well written and has been printed in excellent style, a credit to the publishers. Certain minor discrepancies and errors, typographical and otherwise, have crept in, but these can be corrected in a second edition. By a misspelling James "Fenwick," is given for the eminent architect Renwick, on page 348; a letter to Archbishop Hughes on page 198 is dated 1869, for 1859;

Dr. Pise is spoken of as Constantine Pise, he is usually known as Charles Constantine Pise; the date of Mrs. Seton's reception into the Church, as mentioned on page 13, is based on an uncertain calculation; and the well-known signature of James McMaster is minus the initial of his middle name Alphonsus, without which, the publicist never felt completely at home. In the Preface the Prince-Consort is mentioned as Tennyson's "King." These and other minor inaccuracies mar somewhat the excellent character of the book.

The best tribute in the volume to Cardinal McCloskey is as follows:

> Cardinal McCloskey was above all, and through all, and in all, a man of God. He never sought the applause of the world or the honors of the Church. Life's great ends—peace of soul with God and preparation for the Kingdom above—were his constant thoughts. It was his to occupy the highest place within the gift of the Sovereign Pontiff. It was his to rule the great Archdiocese of New York, during those twenty years of reconstruction that followed the Civil War. It was his to conciliate opposing elements both within and without the Fold, at a time when both Church and State needed all their forces to cope with the tide of immigration which was flowing into the country. New York loomed large in those days on the social and political horizon of the United States; and to him, who by general consent was looked upon as the first citizen of the metropolis, came many of the heaviest burdens which then harassed our land. And yet no trouble ever robbed him of his soul's serenity. No difficulty ever marred the sweet tenderness of that face. He drew to himself all those that loved both God and the children of God. Thousands of unseen charities left his hands without the knowledge of anyone, even of those closest to him. There are living today some among the New York clergy, who were ordained by Cardinal McCloskey, and who hold his name in benediction. He is still remembered by all as a prelate who combined in a very remarkable way the high dignity of his office with the affectionate gentleness of a child.

It was these qualities of mind and heart which prompted the author to apply to Cardinal McCloskey the tribute Tennyson paid to Albert and to see in the dead Cardinal a constant wearing of "the white flower of a blameless life." Cardinal McCloskey lived a well-balanced life—one in which he used all the talents given him by the Creator as a divine gift placed in his hands for the betterment of his fellowmen and for his own eternal happiness.

California: The Name. By Ruth Putnam, with the collaboration of Herbert I. Priestley, Ph. D., University of California Publications in History, Vol. 4, No. 4. University of California, Berkeley, 1918. Pp. 71.

When St. Ignatius Loyola, the founder of the Society of Jesus lay convalescing at the Castle of Loyola, after the siege of Pampeluna, he asked for some of the books on knight-errancy, chiefly the celebrated romance *Amadis de Gaul*. This was in the year 1521, and the romance in question was well-known for a century preceding that date. The equally famous sequel, *Las Sergas de Esplandian*, had been added by Montalvo about 1470, and it is highly probable that the whole book as we have it now was as well read by romantic spirits like Loyola, as Robinson Crusoe has been in our day. The saintly founder admitted that the idea of keeping a night-watch at Mont Serrat came to him from his recollection of the romance.

It is to this medieval novel that Miss Putnam directs her readers in her very entertaining story of the origin of the name: *California*.

Some fifty years ago Edward Everett Hale came upon the word California in Montalvo's sequel. In the *Proceedings* of the American Antiquarian Society, of April, 1862, the conjecture was put forth that here at last was the origin of the name. The different surmises in the matter are described by the author in an Appendix. "If it be assumed," Miss Putnam writes, "that the name was taken bodily from *Las Sergas de Esplandian*, where did Montalvo find it, and, if he coined it, what were his materials?" One of the answers is that of Dr. George Davidson who examined the evidence in 1910. His paper on the *Origin and the meaning of the name "California"* appeared in the *Transactions and Proceedings* of the Geographical Society of the Pacific, of that year. His conclusion is that Dr. Hale's clue is the correct one. Dr. Davidson believed that Montalvo coined the word from Greek roots; but consultation with various Greek scholars does not result in the confirmation of this conjecture. Bancroft had another theory; and an anonymous writer in the *San Francisco Chronicle*, (June 19, 1893), holds that it comes from *Cal y forno*, *cal* meaning *lime*, and *forno*, an *oven* or *kiln*. Others hold that the origin of the word is to be seen in *Kalifat*, the Arabic for *province*. Still

another hypothesis would credit the word as coming from Caliphurnia, Caesar's wife. All these conjectures, even the last, are not above suspicion. Miss Putnam traces the use of the romance *Amadis de Gaul* and finds that it might have been known to the early Spanish explorers, and hence she inclines towards Dr. Hale's theory. The name came finally to be given to the whole Pacific Coast as it was then known: Lower California and Upper California. It is interesting to note that as late as 1679 the geography of the Two Californias was as obscure as the origin of the name. Urbano Cerri's *Relazione* to Pope Innocent XI, speaks of California as "a great Island in the South Sea." Until some other discovery is made, Miss Putnam's question: "Who did then put 'California' on the map?" (p. 345) will still have to be answered by Dr. Hale's theory.

Archbishop Purcell and the Archdiocese of Cincinnati. A Study based on Original Sources. By Sister Mary Agnes McCann, Ph.D. Washington, 1918. Pp. 107.

This dissertation was submitted to the Faculty of the Catholic Sisters College at the Catholic University of America, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. It may justly be termed the first-fruits of the harvest the University is confident it will reap from the field of American Church History.

Sister Mary Agnes is not only the historian of her community, —the Daughters of Charity of Cincinnati, but will always have a prominent place among the historians of the Archdiocese, whose great metropolitan she describes so well in these pages. She has been fortunate in having lived for many years at one of the chief Catholic archives-centres of the United States—Mount St. Joseph on-the-Ohio, near Cincinnati.

John Baptist Purcell, first Archbishop of Cincinnati, was born at Mallow, County Cork, Ireland, on February 26, 1800. At the age of eighteen he left his parents and home and crossed the Atlantic to enter upon his studies for the priesthood. His first two years in Baltimore were spent as private tutor in one of the best families of that city. On May 20, 1820, he entered Mount St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, as student and professor. Here he remained for three years, the companion of a group of students

and ecclesiastics who have left indelible tradition upon the American Church—Dubois, the President of the College, later Bishop of New York; Bruté, the saintly spiritual director of the students, who became Bishop of Vincennes; John McCloskey, the first Prince of the Church in America; Dr. Pise, who later became Chaplain of the United States Senate; John Hughes, first Archbishop of New York; and Father Michael de Burgo Egan, the beloved nephew of Bishop Egan of Philadelphia. Mother Seton, the Foundress of the American Daughters of Charity, was still living when he entered the Mount, as its alumni love to call it; and thus as a young man in his early twenties he came into intimate touch with those whose names will ever be linked with the actual formation of Catholic life in the United States. On March 1, 1822, young Purcell accompanied Father Bruté to France, where he continued his course of theology at the Seminary of St. Sulpice, in Paris. Ordained to the priesthood on May 21, 1826, he returned to the United States in 1827, accompanied by a future Archbishop of Baltimore, Samuel Eccleston. Dr. Purcell first taught at the Mount, and in October, 1829, became President of the College. In 1833, he was consecrated Bishop of Cincinnati, succeeding Bishop Fenwick, O.P., Cincinnati's first Ordinary. The new bishop found Cincinnati a city of about thirty thousand inhabitants, most of them emigrants from the eastern States. For a man of culture and erudition, as Bishop Purcell undoubtedly was, the most pleasant surprise of all was the high standard of education which even then prevailed in the State. The Sisters of Charity, with whose fortunes his name is inseparably connected, had opened a free school in Cincinnati in 1829; and in 1830, the Dominican Sisters had begun another in Somerset, Ohio. Literary culture flourished on all sides, and Bishop Purcell quickly became its foremost exponent. One of the most salient events of his episcopate is his controversy or religious debate with Mr. Alexander Campbell. The history of the Purcell-Campbell Debate, which was published at Cincinnati in 1837, was to be found in the old days on almost every Catholic bookshelf. Nowadays it is forgotten, and one rarely comes across the volume. Cincinnati was erected into a metropolitan See in August, 1850, and Bishop Purcell became its first Archbishop, receiving the Pallium from the hands of Pope Pius IX, in Rome.

It is unfortunate that his long years as Archbishop (1850–1883) have been clouded by the serious financial disaster which threatened for a time materially to cripple the Church in Ohio. The author's explanation of this tragedy is as follows:

> The Archbishop had always been opposed to the care of money and Father Purcell [his brother] a man of very high literary taste, shunned such responsibility, but during the financial panic of 1837, when there was almost a universal suspension of payments by banks and a general distrust of the money market, the sterling honesty of Archbishop Purcell and his brother, Father Edward, had induced thousands of their fellow-citizens to urge them to receive deposits and use them for the needs of the diocese. In the days of the Civil War other sums were added and Father Purcell's notes promised 6 per cent., the legal interest in Ohio.
>
> In the period of reconstruction after the war, Father Purcell ceased taking loans and tried to free himself from the burden of earlier deposits, but the people insisted on leaving their money in his hands. Previous to the collapse of 1878-1879, there had been a series of financial crises, property had depreciated, and securities had lessened in value, so that, finally, when smaller banks, like those of Adae, Hemann, and Bussing, closed their doors, the people were thrown into a panic and a run was made on Father Purcell. In ordinary times, the affair might have been adjusted with less difficulty; for the priests of the diocese, the religious communities, the members of the hierarchy and individuals, immediately offered help. Collateral and property might have been converted into cash and debtors required to pay the amount of their loans, but panic reigned.
>
> The Archbishop during all these years had left the care of the temporalities to his brother, reserving for himself, in particular, the moral, intellectual, and spiritual growth of his diocese; he now insisted on turning over everything available to the creditors. In the hope of doing justice to all, he made an assignment, affixing his name to the document at the Academy of Mount St. Vincent, Cedar Grove. John B. Mannix, Attorney, was the assignee; Charles Stuart and John Holland were witnesses. The Reverend Doctors Byrne and Callaghan were present as attendants of the Archbishop.
>
> The assignee was the recipient of all the moneys, whether debts or donations. Eager to free the Archbishop from the weight of sorrow so suddenly thrust upon him and in the hope of relieving the diocese of its burden, he invested the money of the creditors in what seemed to him gilt-edged securities, but they proved worthless, and made the debt still heavier. The Court then appointed, as assignees, Judge Tafel and Attorney Miller, non-Catholics. Many complications followed, but no better results in the liquidation of the debt. By the persistent efforts of the clergy and the Archbishop's Counsel, order was brought out of chaos, true notes were separated from false, the Court came to a decision on the amount due and it was paid in a reasonable time, but not until it had cost

> the diocese the lives of three men: Archbishop Purcell, Father Edward Purcell, and Doctor Francis Joseph Pabisch, the president of Mount St. Mary's of the West.
>
> When the Archbishop, overwhelmed by the disaster and hoping some younger person might be appointed who could cope with the trouble sent his resignation to Rome in January, 1879, the Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII, through Cardinal Simeoni, announced on March 21, that he would not accept the resignation but would give a coadjutor. The Right Reverend William Henry Elder, Bishop of Natchez, was appointed Coadjutor Bishop of Avara and reached Cincinnati on March 3, 1880.

Fourteen years of litigation, at times bitter in the extreme, followed the financial crash of 1878, and with the help of his brethren in the episcopate, the debt was reduced and finally all was paid off during the administration of his successor, Archbishop William Henry Elder. Archbishop Purcell died on July 4, 1883.

Sister Mary Agnes' work is not, strictly speaking, a biography. That no doubt will come when she has had leisure to arrange the great collection of Church papers of which she is the custodian. But we have in her study an intelligent and careful use of letters and documents published here for the first time. Through these *Journals* and *Letters* from which she has culled so many interesting facts and side-lights for the story of the Church in Ohio, we are able to see how noble was the attitude of these pioneers who had to lay the foundation stones of a great archdiocese and how beautifully human they were in their dealings with all about them. A good working bibliography is added to the books, and before many months have passed it is hoped that we shall possess a complete *Life and Times of Archbishop Purcell*, worthy to be placed alongside her excellent study: *The History of Mother Seton's Daughters of Charity*.

NOTES AND COMMENT

With the cordial approbation of the Archbishop of Chicago, the Illinois Catholic Historical Society has issued the first number of its quarterly, the *Illinois Catholic Historical Review*. Illinois is celebrating two great anniversaries this year: one, the centenary of the Statehood of Illinois, and the other, the seventy-fifth anniversary of the foundation of the Diocese of Chicago. A *Foreword* by Father Siedenburg, S. J., tells the reader that the need of an historical review is notably apparent in such States as California, Maryland and Illinois. "The glorious history of Catholic Illinois," he says, "has but few worshippers because for the most part, it is a hidden shrine. But those who knew some of its glories and were interested to know more, regretted that it did not have a medium to bring them to light." The founding of the Illinois Catholic Historical Society in February, 1918, brought into one association historical scholars and writers such as Father Gilbert Garraghan, S. J., Rev. Frederick Beuckmann, Rev. J. B. Culemans, and Mr. Joseph Thompson, who is editor-in-chief of the new Review. It was apparent to all that the present year of centennial was a propitious time in which to begin such a publication. It would be hard to signal any one of the articles of the first number as possessing more historic worth than the others. The whole number is valuable. Much of it is first hand. Father Garraghan's article on *Early Catholicity in Chicago* (1673-1843) is singularly worthy of merit, and will form a splendid contribution to local Catholic history when finished. Mr. Thompson furnishes two articles: one on *The Illinois Missions*, and the other on *Illinois' First Citizen—Pierre Gibault*. Father Beuckmann, who is rapidly making his name as the historian of his diocese, offers an interesting account of *Civil and Religious Jurisdiction in Illinois*. Two well-known historical scholars—Dr. Clarence W. Alvord and Mr. William Stetson Merrill—are among the contributors. *A Chronology of Missions and Churches in Illinois* (1675-1844) contains a list of all the Catholic centers and is a geographical guide to the growth of the Church in this section.

The problem of an historical review is complex in the extreme. Three things are necessary: writers, abundant material, financial support. It is notorious that at no period of Catholic historiography in this country were efforts of an historical nature adequately supported. Our two oldest Historical Societies, those of New York and of Philadelphia, would long since have ceased publication were it not for generous persons who support them. Today with the high cost of print-paper, of printing, and with the added charge for mailing, the financial aspect of such a venture seems to be a hazardous one. There will always be a limited number of paying subscribers. Interest in history is not widespread, interest in American history less, and interest in American Catholic history least of all. Publications of such eminent worth as the *American Historical Review* and the *Historical Outlook* cannot depend upon subscriptions to carry them along year by year. Comes the question of historical materials. That these exist in abundance for the old Illinois Country there is sufficient

evidence in the work already done by Dr. Alvord. What is of pressing importance is a group of scholarly writers trained in historical research and composition. It is idle to hope for a high standard of excellence unless those who are interested in historical work have also had training in historical method. It is this lack of training which gives an ephemeral character to most of the work done by Catholic writers of history. Many traditional pages have crept into the Book of Deeds of the Church in America, and there is no advance in reiterating them. Training cannot be had outside the historical laboratory. The master must be constantly with his disciples. *Primus inter pares* he must sit among them, developing each one according to his talents. If then great Catholic centers in the United States mean to reawaken the dead past as this group of scholars in Chicago is attempting for the archdiocese, it must look beyond its own circle for followers. And these followers must be trained. Every Catholic Historical Society should have a skilled archivist and librarian and one or two members on its editorial staff who have been trained in the school of historical methodology.

It would be interesting to know from what authentic source the Hon. Isaac Siegel of New York culled the following statement which was made in his speech on the Selective-Draft Law before the House of Representatives on April 15, 1918.

> In 1805, when the treaty of peace [with France] was signed, Pius VII, who was then occupying St. Peter's chair in Rome, issued a statement to the world in which he said that the new Republic, the United States of America, had done more for humanity in that war than all the Christian nations of Europe put together. So you see, my friends, over one hundred years ago, when we were still a humble nation trying to uphold and maintain a fitting station among the free countries of the world, we were fighting the cause of humanity.

In Memoriam: The Clerical Bead Roll of the Diocese of Alton, Illinois, published by the Rev. A. Zurbonsen, pastor of the Immaculate Conception parish of Quincy, Ill., contains a brief biographical sketch of all the priests who worked in that part of the Illinois vineyard. Among the numerous ecclesiastics whose life and labors in the diocese are enshrined in this Book of Remembrance, the Rev. Augustine Tolton, the first colored priest in the United States deserves a place of prominence. He was born at Brush Creek, Missouri, on April 1, 1854. His parents moved to Quincy, Ill., in 1861, and Augustine Tolton was educated at St. Peter's parochial school and St. Francis' College. His unusual ability attracted attention and he was sent to the College of Propaganda Fide, Rome, where he was ordained to the priesthood on April 24, 1886. Father Tolton returned to Quincy, and was given charge of a parish made up entirely of the colored Catholics of the city. In 1889, he was transferred to St. Monica's Church, Chicago, where a larger field of activity awaited him. His unstinting zeal proved too much for a physique which had never been strong, and he died at the age of 43, on July 9, 1897.

The article: *The Historical Records of Scandanavians in America*, published in the *Minnesota History Bulletin* for May, 1918, brings to light the fact that in spite of all that has been written "this field has been but little cultivated." We need first of all the comprehensive collection of all the materials for the history of the Scandanavian element in the New World; and the writer suggests that the rich sources already known to scholars be assembled at some central depository. How valuable some of this material is, can be gathered from the fact that the only copy of Ole Nattestad's volume: *Beskrivelse over en Reise til Nordamerica, Begyndt den 8de April, 1837 og skrevet paa Skibet Hilda samt siden Fortsat paa Reisen op igjennem de Forende Stater i Nordamerica, af Ole Knudsen Nattestad Fra Nummedal*, published at Drammar, in 1839 (31 pp.), is in the Library of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin. Scholars were searching for this little pamphlet for years, when this copy was discovered in Norway in 1900. There is surely here a work of love for the Twin Cities of Minneapolis and St. Paul, since the great bulk of the Scandinavian population in the United States radiates from these two centers. Fortunately, the University of Minnesota has begun to cultivate the field of the Scandinavian countries, languages and literatures. The cooperation of the Minnesota Historical Society gives fine promise of successful monographs in this subject.

Father Arthur E. Jones, S. J., of St. Mary's College, Montreal, who died on January 19, 1918, was one of the most skilled archivists in America. He was associated with Dr. Thwaites in editing the *Jesuit Relations*, and made important contributions to that great series. His chief work was in connection with the Huron Missions and the *Fifth Annual Report* of the Department of Archives of Ontario contains the results of his long years of research under the general title *Huronia*.

One of the best pages in *The Fortnightly Review* in recent years, is the well-written and instructive article by Father Rothensteiner *On The Writing of Parish Histories*. An appeal was made in the January (1916) number of the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW to all pastors who were celebrating the Golden Jubilee of their parishes that year to read the Rev. Dr. Cox's handy little volume: *How to Write the History of a Parish* (London, 1895). Dr. Cox wrote for England, where a wealth of topographical records, manuscripts and books exists for many of the pre-Reformation parishes. The American clergy will find in Father Rothensteiner's pages a number of valuable suggestions for this special sort of research work. Recently the Rev. Dr. Theobald Spetz, C.R., published a history, entitled: *The Catholic Church in Waterloo County*, a part of Hamilton Diocese in the Province of Quebec. Dean Harris contributes the Preface. "It is a pity," writes Dr. Spetz, "that someone had not undertaken this work fifteen or twenty years ago, when many of the old settlers were still alive." The work of writing a Parish History is not difficult, providing a strict adherence to a given method be kept. There are, generally speaking, three parts to the work: first, the collection of the material; secondly, the critical appraisal of the material; and thirdly, the actual work of composition and printing. In the

matter of collecting material, sufficient attention is not usually paid to the fact that persons in the parish may have newspaper clippings, photographs, letters, etc., which would give life to the past history of the locality; nor is sufficient attention given to oral tradition. The oldest parishioners have memories of the early days. These traditions could easily be controlled. Former pastors and assistants may throw light on little known events of the parish. The Parish History should not be written as if the congregation had lived apart from the civic community. Histories of the State and of the city or county often add material of value to the parochial setting. In gathering the facts from the source-material collected, the system of using uniform cards (five by eight inches) is the best. One fact only ought to be put on a card. The card should contain references to the sources from which this fact has been obtained, and all references should be full and exact. These cards can b arranged either in order of time, of place, or of subject-idea. The writer should read all around his subject. Facts need atmosphere in which to live. They should be seen in the light of current history. Accuracy is absolutely necessary. Where doubt exists, care should be taken to inform the reader. All facts should be tested. Even in such a small matter as dates, the utmost care is necessary. Recently, we were given a copy of a Parish History, written by a careful student; it was later controlled page by page by one who had spent many years in arranging a correct chronology of Catholic events in that part of the country. Every page that contained a date, needed correction by this second hand. Parish history is not a concatenation of religious events. No community is ever the same after the opening of a Catholic church or school. Even real estate men know that truth. And the parochial life should be seen through this civic prism. The story of educational efforts, of Catholic social action, and of civic movements should have a place in such a work. To write a Parish History may be more difficult than to collect the material necessary. The story should first be written chronologically without any attempt at style. The divisions into chapters or parts ought to be quite natural. Once the whole framework of the story is complete—complete in this sense, that it is a full and accurate account of the parish—embellishment may take place. There should be an Appendix of the more valuable documents, such as excerpts from the Church Records, and good photographs should be liberally scattered through the pages. A bibliography of all that has been written on the parish or on parish events will add to the value of such a volume. Lastly, there should be an Index. It is rare that one is found in this class of historical works. Copies of all Parish Histories should be sent to the Diocesan Chancery, to the local libraries, to the Library of Congress, to the libraries of all near-by institutions, and to the National Catholic library which has been inaugurated at the Catholic University of America.

In this connection may be mentioned with praise the *Memorial Sketch of Bishop William Louis Du Bourg and What His Coming meant in St. Louis*, compiled from original sources by the Rev. Dr. Souvay and Father Holweck—a booklet issued under the auspices of the Catholic Historical Society of St. Louis. Bishop Du Bourg won all hearts at once "by

his majestic presence combined with general humility and great kindliness of manner." Dr. Souvay's articles in the REVIEW on the early days of the Church in St. Louis are an evidence that a complete Life of Bishop Du Bourg is both possible and desirable.

The Missouri Historical Society Collections contain many papers for the student of the Catholic history of that State. Many interesting *Journals* have been published in the series, and there are several papers of permanent worth on the French *émigrés* of 1848. The Spanish days of Missouri history have been dealt with in more than one number of the Society's *Quarterly*. One important paper is that by Rev. J. J. Conway, S.J., on *The Beginnings of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction in the Archdiocese of St. Louis* (1764–1776), published by the Society in 1897.

An Historical Sketch of St. Benedict's Parish, Atchison, Kansas, 1858–1908, by the Rev. Gerard Heinz, O.S.B., displays an intelligent advance over the *editio typica* which seems to dominate parochial historians in the United States. There are chapters of real interest on the *Baptismal Record* and the *First Pew Register*. The former is well described, and the method used by Father Heinz in tabulating its contents might serve as a model for all similar publications. Photographs of all persons and places of importance in and around the parish are given in the volume. An Index would have added prestige to the book.

At the Centennial Celebration of the State of Missouri, held at Columbia, Mo., on January 8, 1918, the Rev. John Rothsteiner, Secretary of the Catholic Historical Society of St. Louis, spoke upon *The Missouri Priest One Hundred Years Ago*. St. Louis was then a city of about two thousand inhabitants; and when the first bishop, Dr. Du Bourg, came to St. Louis, the Church that was to serve as his Cathedral was a little log structure, the episcopal residence a little stone house with two rooms, and the furniture was barely sufficient. Father Rothensteiner says:

> How the Church has prospered during the century since his coming, how the great institutions of learning and charity, pre-eminently the Seminary of St. Mary's at the Barrens and the ever flourishing University of St. Louis, sprang into being under his fostering care, how the congregations multiplied and were served by a numerous and faithful clergy, how successive cathedrals reared their proud spires and domes to heaven, how the light of the gospel was carried out from his foundation to the Indians of the plains as far as the Rocky Mountains, how diocese after diocese was established within the wide territory once entrusted to his care, and how the Upper Louisiana of old has become, under God's Providence, the home of as many episcopal sees as there were parishes within its bounds one hundred years ago—all this is a matter of deep wonder and interest, and Bishop Du Bourg's influence can be traced in all its manifold currents. . . I hope I have shown what I set out to show: that our state is better, nobler, richer in the things of the mind, more prosperous because more upright and dutiful, more deserving of our love, and more deeply beloved for the ministry of the "Missouri Priest, One Hundred Years Ago."

Has the *Catholic Encyclopedia* answered the wants so strongly expressed by John Gilmary Shea some thirty years ago in an article entitled: *A National Catholic Library*, published in the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* for January, 1886? "The time will come," he says, "when utter ignorance of Catholic doctrine and Catholic Life will be considered disgraceful, but it is not so now; and men well informed in every other branch of knowledge except a knowledge of the religion of their own ancestors, every day with the utmost serenity gravely enunciate statements that a Catholic child could refute." Dr. Shea believed that what the country lacked was a central clearance house to which queries could come from all parts of the country, and the heart of this clearance house would be "a grand central Catholic library, to be gradually enriched with every work of merit in dogmatic, moral, mystic, and ascetic theology, biblical literature, and linguistic, patristics, liturgical and ceremonial, canon law, church history, hagiography, and biography." As a means of making the library useful to Catholics and others throughout the country, he says: "If our projected University [The Catholic University of America] were in operation, as we hope soon to see, a body of Fellows might be established attached to a great library, with a salary, whose duty it would be to make researches, answer queries, and where necessary send a work to the regular subscribers of the Library."

Thirty-two years have passed since Dr. Shea saw this noble vision. The "grand central Catholic library" has not yet come to the doors of America's greatest Catholic educational institution. "Some of our liberal-minded men ought to take up the question of the great University library as their especial part of this work, and leave its shelves loaded with the lore of the Church's nineteen centuries of existence, as the noblest monument to preserve their memory when they depart, and to hand down their name with honor to future generations. No family could wish or have a more enduring monument than a department in such a library, founded and maintained by it, bearing to all time the family names. In thousands of books that department would in time be referred to by name till its reputation was as wide as the Church itself." The Fellows spoken of by Dr. Shea have not yet begun to frequent the University campus, but the possibility of the Library is nearer than many suppose, and once the present war is over, there is every hope of seeing reared in majestic proportions a Library which will not only answer the purpose spoken of by the late eminent historian but serve in other ways to link Catholic thought and action with the Catholic University.

As a beginning of one department of this "grand central Catholic library," namely, the *National Catholic Library* which will contain all that has ever been printed on or about the Church in the United States, there has been recently installed in one of the large rooms of Divinity Hall the *Rev. Arthur T. Connolly Library of Americana*. There in one room are gathered some six thousand of the rarest books on American history, duplicate copies of which exist only in the British Museum and the Library of Congress. A catalogue of this valuable collection will be issued in due time. Meanwhile, historical students in the United States are welcome to its use. Queries will be gladly answered, and references or quotations made and verified. The *Connolly Library* as it will always be known, will also be the *Academy of American Church History*.

But to return to the *Catholic Encyclopedia*. So much has been said in its praise since the first volume of this great work appeared in 1907, that it is unnecessary to point out its splendid value for just such an emergency or series of emergencies described by Dr. Shea. But too little has been said of its value to the historian of the Church in the United States. Out of a possible ten thousand topics of persons, places, things, movements, etc., which ought to be found in a *Dictionary of American Catholic History*, the *Catholic Encyclopedia* contains almost three-fourths of that number. The *Index* is a mine of American Catholic historical facts, and a well-filled volume might be published containing in alphabetical order the articles dealing with American Catholic history.

One of the sad pages in Cardinal Farley's *Life of John Cardinal McCloskey*, is that which gives us an account of the apostasy of the Rev. John Murray Forbes, D. D. Dr. Forbes was born in New York in 1807, and graduated from Columbia College in 1827. Ordained to the Episcopal ministry in 1830, he soon became prominent in Episcopal circles and in 1834, was appointed Rector of St. Luke's, New York City. At the same time he taught Pastoral Theology in the General Theological Seminary. In 1849, he became a Catholic and after a year spent in preparation at the Fordham Seminary, was ordained to the Catholic priesthood by Cardinal (then Bishop) McCloskey, on November 16, 1850. His defection in October, 1859, caused a sensation in New York. His open letter to Archbishop Hughes, announcing his withdrawal from the Church does not state openly what cause or causes impelled him to make this decision, beyond the statement that he had not been able to sustain his Catholic convictions "in face of the fact that by it [communion with Rome] the natural rights of man and all individual liberty must be sacrificed, not only so, but the private conscience often violated, and one forced by silence, at least, to acquiesce in what is opposed to moral truth and virtue." Dr. Forbes died at Elizabeth, N. J., on October 11, 1885, at the age of seventy-nine.

Through the courtesy of the Librarian of the General Theological Seminary, we have been allowed to go over the files of *The Churchman* and the *Church Review*, in many numbers of which are references to Dr. Forbes. A history of the Seminary is being written by one of the professors and this will throw much light upon his later career. From 1869 to 1872, he was Dean of the Seminary. A citation from Dr. Forbes' inaugural to the Seminarians is interesting, if placed side-by-side with his letter to Archbishop Hughes: "You are now preparing yourselves," he says, "to become ministers of Christ's church. Begin, then, early to pursue the road which the Church dictates. You must no longer think your own thoughts, or form your own plans, but learn what the Church teaches and obey what she commands."

In none of our wars have the Catholic troops been so well cared for spiritually as in the present. With the sole exception of the French troops who aided in American Revolution, the regiments leaving our shores today for France and the regiments in training at home have the largest number, proportionately, of chaplains ever accompanying the American army. Recently, the indefatigable

Thomas F. Meehan wrote in *America* an article describing the efforts made to furnish chaplains to the soldiers during the Civil War. (*War-Time Notes about Archbishop Hughes*, in *America*, Vol. xix, pp. 12–13.) In some letters which have recently come into our keeping, there are several others touching on this problem. The first in order of time is from Archbishop Kenrick to Archbishop Hughes, dated Baltimore, April 26, 1861:

MOST REVD. AND DEAR SIR:

I have just received your favor of 22d inst. informing me of the fact, that one or more clergymen of your diocese accompany the troops to Washington in the capacity of chaplains. To enable them to exercise faculties in this diocese, I beg of you to accept the communication of all my faculties, and to communicate them at discretion. We all deplore the war which threatens to assume a frightful character. . . . Life is scarcely desirable if we are to witness the horrors of civil war. As yet we have suffered nothing here, as religion is not an element of the contest. Our citizens are somewhat recovered from the excitement and alarm caused by the unfortunate conflict of last Friday. Many Catholics are preparing by prayer and the sacraments for the danger which impends. I pray God to preserve the country from war.

Your devoted br. in Xt.,

FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK.

The Most Reverend
The Archbishop of New York.

A second letter from Kenrick to Hughes, dated Baltimore, June 24, 1861, gives a mild reproof to a Northern chaplain who blessed a cannon. The gentle Archbishop of Baltimore feared that the priest in question was irregular *ex defectu lenitatis*. There is one letter in the series which does not touch on the question of chaplains, but which must one day be given a prominent page in the history of the Church during the Civil War; it is from Bishop Lynch of Charleston, dated August 4, 1861. He is surprised, he says at its conclusion, and somewhat ashamed "of the lengths to which my pen has run. But the night is hot, too hot for sleep. I arose from my couch, and have spent a couple of hours speaking to you as frankly and unreservedly, as you have ever kindly allowed me to do." A letter, dated Washington, D. C., October 21, 1861, the most valuable of all, is the one from Abraham Lincoln, published by Mr. Meehan in the article above-mentioned, the original of which is in our possession:

ARCHBISHOP HUGHES,

RT. REV. SIR:

I am sure you will pardon me if, in ignorance, I do not address you with technical correctness.

I find no law authorizing the appointment of Chaplains for our *hospitals;* and yet the services of chaplains are more needed, perhaps, in the hospitals than with the healthy soldiers in the field. With this view I have given a sort of *quasi* appointment (a copy of which I enclose) to each of three protestant ministers, who have accepted, and entered upon the duties.

If you perceive no objection, I will thank you to give me the name, or names, of one or more suitable persons of the Catholic Church, to whom I may with propriety, tender the same service.

Many thanks for your kind and judicious letters to Gov. Seward, and which he regularly allows me both the pleasure and the profit of perusing.

With the highest respect,
Your Obd. Servt.,
A. LINCOLN.

Accompanying the letter is a copy of the quasi-appointment; this also bears Abraham Lincoln's signature:

Executive Mansion,
Washington, 1861.

SIR:

Having been solicited by Christian Ministers and other pious people to appoint suitable persons to act as chaplains at the hospitals for our sick and wounded soldiers and feeling the intrinsic propriety of having such persons to so act, and yet believing there is no law conferring the power upon me to appoint them, I think fit to say that if you will voluntarily enter upon and perform the appropriate duties of such position, I will recommend that Congress make compensation therefor, at the same rate as Chaplains in the Army are compensated.

A. LINCOLN.

A letter from Archbishop Kenrick to Archbishop Hughes, dated Baltimore, September 23, 1862, speaks of the Sisters:

MOST REVD. AND DEAR SIR:

The Surgeon General is desirous of having the services of Sisters for the hospitals, as Major Garesché writes in date of yesterday. Emmitsburg can not furnish any more than already given. As you intimated last year that some from your diocese were ready to devote themselves to this good work, I would be grateful if you would correspond with him in order to make the necessary arrangements. It will be proper that the members of the various institutes have charge of separate hospitals. I write to Major Garesché by this mail to ask him to have the correspondence opened by the Surgeon General. A hospital is about to be opened on the Jesuit grounds near St. Aloysius'.

My brother states that Revd. P. J. Ryan declined accepting the commission of hospital chaplain, partly because it embraced all the hospitals in and about St. Louis, in which sick soldiers were found, and partly because it imposed the necessity of taking the oath of allegiance, which he was unwilling to take, not being disposed to be naturalized. He is a very respectable priest, conscientiously loyal.

The Sisters may experience difficulty in regard to their spiritual duties unless some arrangement be made for chaplains. These are generally Preachers. It is hard for the Sisters to hear Mass even on Sundays. The Surgeon General asked me some months ago to designate a priest for them, and took no notice of my request to have him appointed and provided for. The Jesuits will no doubt look to those who will be in charge of the St. Aloysius' hospital in Washington. Public notice has been given that no new Chaplains will be appointed. If a moderate addition were made to the allowance for the Sisters, it might be the least invidious mode of providing for the priest in attendance. I have the honor to remain, Most Revd. Dear Sir,

Your devoted br. in Xt.,
FRANCIS PATRICK KENRICK.

Reference has already been made in these pages to the account given by the Hon. Ambrose Kennedy, of Rhode Island, to the work done by the nuns of the battlefield during the Civil War.

The volumes by Hassard and by Kehoe, as Mr. Meehan tells us, have unfortunately long been out of print. "The copies still available in libraries would provide most instructive lessons of conduct just at present for all classes of patriotic citizens."

Catholic lovers of old Philadelphia history will be happy to possess a precious little volume: *Cobb's Creek in the Days of the Old Powder Mill*, by Dr. John W. Eckfeldt. The illustrations are almost as valuable as the text. Dr. Eckfeldt has been associated with the people of the valley for almost fifty years and he has been able to gather many interesting traditions of the old days when Cobb's Creek region was a thriving section of Catholics, many of whom, like Denis Kelly, attained renown beyond the range of hills that separated them from the outside world. The book contains a picture of St. Dennis' Church, the first Catholic church erected in Delaware County, which was built mainly through Mr. Kelly's generosity in 1825. The old powder mills along Cobb's Creek were turned into cloth mills about 1840. They helped furnish cloth to the Government during the Civil War. At present they are all abandoned; the mills have disappeared or are in ruins; the houses, with few exceptions, are gone, or fallen into decay. Only the lovely valley remains with its charming ravines and its avenues of noble trees.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

THE "CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA" DIOCESAN BIBLIOGRAPHY

There exists no complete bibliography of the Catholic Church in the United States. The only work published thus far that approaches the problem is Finotti's *Bibliographia Catholica Americana*. Finotti's work, however, is not a technical one. It is a list of books written and published by Catholic authors in the United States, and it covers only the years 1789 to 1820. What is needed is a volume similar to that published by Professors Channing, Hart, and Turner: *Guide to the Study of American History*. They selected from the immense mass of rich material on American History all that was likely to be most immediately useful to the searcher in political, social, constitutional, and economic American history. A *Bibliography of American Catholic History* is the work of a lifetime. It can hardly be done by any one scholar or student. Help must be asked from the thousands of American Catholics who are interested in such a study; and help must come especially from the clergy.

It is only after long deliberation that a plan has been decided upon for launching this much-needed work. We begin by publishing the bibliographies to be found at the end of all the articles in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* which treat of the Dioceses and Archdioceses of the United States. Part I of this bibliograph was published in the July (1918) issue of the REVIEW. Copies of these pages will then be sent to all who are known to be students of American Church history, with the request that books be added. From time to time these completed lists will be reprinted in the REVIEW, and all those who assist in the work will be given credit for the same. For the present, the usual divisions of *Sources* and *Books* must be abandoned, and the final classification will be postponed until it is concluded that the lists as published are as exhaustive as possible. The scheme to be followed will be chronological, that is, the fourteen Provinces will be taken up in the order of their erection and under each Province or Archdiocese the Suffragan Bishoprics as they are at present will be placed, again in the order of their erection. Through the courtesy of the Editors of the *Catholic Encyclopedia* we are permitted to use their volumes for these purposes.

PART II

VII. PROVINCE OF SAN FRANCISCO (1840–1853)[16]

1. San Francisco (1853).

MANUSCRIPTS: In the Cathedral Archives, San Francisco—*Diary of Bishop Diego y Morena, continued by Archbishop Alemany; A. S. Taylor MSS.; Records of the Missions of San Francisco de Asis, San José, Santa Clara, San Francisco Solano, and San Rafael; Chancery Records.*

In the University of California: *Spanish and Mexican Archives of California* (copies of the originals burnt in the San Francisco fire of

[16] Erected as Diocese of the Californias in 1840 and as the Archdiocese of San Francisco in 1853.

1906); *Bancroft Collection of MSS.; Pioneer MSS.; Seville and Mexican Transcripts.*

Synodus Diocesana Sanct. Francisci Habita 1862 (San Francisco, 1872); *Concilii Prov. S.F.; II, Acta et Decreta* (San Francisco, 1883); GLEASON, *Catholic Church in California* (San Francisco, 1872); BANCROFT, *History of California* (San Francisco, 1885); GREY, *Pioneer Times in California* (San Francisco, 1881); CLINCH, *California and Its Missions* (San Francisco, 1904); HITTEL, *History of San Francisco* (San Francisco, 1878); ROYCE, *California* (Boston, 1886); DWINELLE, *Colonial History of San Francisco* (3rd ed., San Francisco, 1866); WILLEY, *Transition Period of California* (San Francisco, 1901); SHUCK, *California Scrap Book* (San Francisco, 1868); MOSES, *Establishment of Municipal Government in San Francisco* (Baltimore, 1889); BLACKMAR, *Spanish Institutions of the Southwest* (Baltimore, 1891); RICHMAN, *California under Spain and Mexico* (Boston, 1911); MARRYAT, *Mountains and Molehills* (London, 1855); KELLY, *The Diggings of California* (London, 1852); DE SMET, *Western Missions and Missionaries* (New York, 1863); RIORDAN, *The First Half-Century* (San Francisco, 1905); ENGLEHARDT, *The Franciscans in California* (Harbor Springs, 1897); ROSSI, *Six Ans en Amérique (Californie et Orégon)* (Paris, 1863); FRIGNET, *La Californie* (2nd ed., Paris, 1867); FERRY, *La Nouvelle Californie* (Paris, 1850); LEVY, *Les Français en Californie* (San Francisco, 1884); MAGUIRE, *The Irish in America* (New York, 1868), xiii; SWASEY, *Early Days and Men of California* (San Francisco, 1894); QUIGLEY, *The Irish Race in California* (San Francisco, 1878); YORKE, *Wendte Controversy* (San Francisco, 1896); SHEA, *Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1892); GLEASON, *Golden Jubilee of the Archdiocese of San Francisco* (San Francisco, 1903); *For. Rel. of U. S., Append. II, Pious Fund of the Californias* (documents) (Washington, 1903); O'MEARA, *Broderick and Gwin* (San Francisco, 1881); the Local and County Histories of HALLEY, HALL, FRAZER, BOWEN, MENEFEE, etc.; Silver and Golden Jubilee Memorials of different religious orders of the Archdiocese; *Society of California Pioneers, Annual Reports* (San Francisco); *California Historical Society*, papers (San Francisco); *Academy of Pacific Coast History*, papers (San Francisco); *Metropolitan Directory* and *Catholic Directory* (1850–1911); *Monitor* (San Francisco), files; *Freeman's Journal* (New York, 1850–60), files; *Alta California* (San Francisco), early files; *Evening Bulletin* (San Francisco), files, especially *A. S. Taylor Papers; Evening Examiner* (San Francisco), files, especially *Phil. Roach Papers; Herald* (San Francisco), early files; *Dominicana* (San Francisco), files; *Overland Monthly* (San Francisco), files; *Grizzly Bear* (San Francisco), files; all San Francisco newspapers (period following fire of 1906).

2. Monterey and Los Angeles (1840–1850).[17]

Santa Barbara Mission Archives; Bishop's Archives (Los Angeles); ENGLEHARDT, *The Franciscans in California* (Harbor Springs, Mich., 1897); REUSS, *Biogr. Cyclop. of the Hierarchy of the U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898); *Catholic Directory.*

[17] Erected as Diocese of the Californias in 1840; as the Diocese of Monterey in 1850, and since 1859 as the Diocese of Monterey and Los Angeles.

3. Sacramento (1861–1868–1886).[18]

SHEA, *The Hierarchy of the Cath. Church in the U. S.* (New York, 1886); SHEA, *Hist. of the Cath. Church in the United States*, IV (New York, 1886–93); *Catholic Directory* (1911); *Lives of American Prelates in Mem. Vol. 3rd Plenary Council* (Baltimore, 1885); *Sacramento Union*, files; *Catholic Herald* (Sacramento, 26 Dec., 1908); *Monitor* (San Francisco, 16 July, 1910); *Statistics of Population of California*, compiled for the use of the Legislature (1911); *Missiones Catholicae* (Rome, 1901).

4. Salt Lake (1886–1890).[19]

SALPOINTE, *Soldiers of the Cross;* HOWLETT, *Life of Rt. Rev. Joseph P. Machebeuf;* DE SMET, Letter published in *Précis Historiques* (Brussels, 19 Jan., 1858); CHITTENDEN, *Father De Smet's Life and Travels among the North American Indians;* HARRIS, *The Catholic Church in Utah.*

VIII. PROVINCE OF BOSTON (1808–1875)[20]

1. Boston (1808).

SHEA, *History of the Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1886); IDEM, *Life and Times of the Most Rev. John Carroll* (Ib., 1888); HAMON, *Vie du Cardinal de Cheverus* (Paris, 1858, tr. WALSH, Philadelphia, 1839; tr. STEWART, Boston, 1839); FITTON, *Sketches of the Establishment of the Church in New England* (Boston, 1872); CREAGH, *Laity's Directory* (New York, 1822); *Catholic Observer* (Boston, 1847), files; *Mémoires de P. De Sales Laternere* (Quebec, 1813); *Gazette de Québec* (22 October, 1789, supplement); *American Cath. Hist. Researches* (January, 1889; July, 1902); FINOTTI, *Bibliographia Cath. Americana* (New York, 1872); CLARKE, *Lives of the Deceased Bishops* (New York, 1872); *The Pilot* (Boston, 2 January, 1836–1907), files; REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. of the Hierarchy of the U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1879); *U. S. Cath. Magazine* (Baltimore), viii, 102 sqq.; U. S. CATH. HIST. SOC., *Hist. Records and Studies* (New York, October, 1906), IV, parts I and II; SULLIVAN, *Catholic Church of New England, Archdiocese of Boston* (Boston and Portland, 1895); LEAHY in *History of Catholic Church in the New England States* (Boston, 1899), I; *Memorial Volume, One Hundredth Anniversary Celebration of the Dedication of the Church of the Holy Cross, Boston* (Boston, 1904); H. F. BROWNSON, *Orestes A. Brownson's Early Life;* IDEM, *Middle Life* (Detroit, 1898–99).

2. Hartford (1843).

O'DONNELL, *History of the Catholic Church in New England* (Boston, 1899); CLARKE, *Deceased Bishops* (New York, 1872); SHEA, *The Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1888); *The Catholic Transcript* (Hartford, Conn.); *The Connecticut Catholic Year Book* (Hartford, Conn.).

3. Burlington (1853).

DE GOESBRIAND, *Catholic Memoirs of Vermont and New Hampshire* (Burlington, Vt., 1886); MICHAUD in *History of the Catholic Ch. in the*

[18] Erected as the Vicariate of Marysville in 1861, as the Diocese of Grass Valley in 1868, and transferred to Sacramento in 1886.

[19] Erected as Vicariate of Utah in 1886 and as Diocese of Salt Lake in 1890.

[20] Erected as Diocese in 1808, and as Archdiocese in 1875.

New England States (Boston, 1899), II; SHEA, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1904); REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. of the Cath. Hierarchy of U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898); *Catholic Directory*, 1907.

4. Portland (1853).

CLARKE, *Deceased Bishops* (New York, 1872); SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in U. S.* (New York, 1888); YOUNG, *Diocese of Portland* (Boston, 1899); WILTZIUS, *Official Directory*, 1910.

5. Springfield (1870).

MCCOY, *History of the Catholic Church in New England* (Boston, 1899); FITTON, *Sketches of the Establishment of the Catholic Church in New England* (Boston, 1872); SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1890); MALANEY, *Catholic Pittsfield and Berkshire* (Pittsfield, 1897); *The Official Catholic Directory* (New York, 1911).

6. Providence (1872).

History of the Catholic Church in New England: Diocese of Providence, I; *Chancery Records*.

7. Manchester (1884).

Diocesan Archives; History of Catholic Church in New England; Guidon, files: *Life of Bishop Bradley* (Manchester, 1905); *Life of Rev. Wm. McDonald* (Manchester, 1909); *Official Catholic Directory* (Milwaukee).

8. Fall River (1904).

Diocesan Archives; Catholic Directory (Milwaukee, 1908); *Missiones Catholicae* (Rome, 1907); *American College Bulletin* (Louvain), April, 1907; *Catholic Union* (New Bedford, Feb., 1908).

IX. PROVINCE OF PHILADELPHIA (1808-1875)[21]

1. Philadelphia (1808).

SHEA, *Hist. of the Cath. Church in the U. S.* (New York, 1886–92); MAHONY, *Historical Sketches of the Cath. Churches and Institutions of Philadelphia;* KIRLIN, *Catholicity in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1909); *Catholic Standard and Times*, files; *Am. Cath. Hist. Researches; Official Cath. Directory* (1911).

2. Pittsburgh (1843).

BARON, *Register of Baptisms and Burials in Fort Duquesne*, 1753–1756; CRAIG, *History of Pittsburgh* (Pittsburgh, 1851—); *The Catholic* (Pittsburgh, 1844–1911), files; *St. Vincent's in Pennsylvania* (New York, 1873); O'CONNOR, *Diocesan Register* (Pittsburgh, 1843); LAMBING, *History of the Diocese of Pittsburgh* (New York, 1880); BECK, *The Redemptorists in Pittsburgh* (Pittsburgh, 1889); LAMBING, *Catholic Historical Researches* (Pittsburgh, 1884–86); GRIFFIN, *American Catholic Historical Researches* (Philadelphia, 1886–1911); IDEM, *History of Bishop Egan* (Philadelphia, 1893): *History of Pittsburgh* (Pittsburgh, 1908); *Cathedral Record, Pittsburgh* (Pittsburgh, 1895–1911); SHEA, *History of the Catholic Church in the United States* (New York, 1892).

[21] Erected as Diocese in 1808, and as Archdiocese in 1875.

3. Erie (1853).

LAMBING, *Hist. Cath. Ch. in Diocese of Pittsburgh* (New York, 1880); BATES, *Hist. of Cranford County;* SMALL, *Legislative Hand-Book;* SHEA, *Hist. of Cath. Ch. in U. S.* (New York, 1894); REUSS, *Biog. Cyclo. of Cath. Hierarchy of U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898).

4. Harrisburg (1868).

Catholic Directory (1909); *The Catholic* (Pittsburgh); *The Catholic Standard and Times* (Philadelphia), files; REUSS, *Biog. Cycl. Cath. Hierarchy of U. S.* (Milwaukee, 1898).

5. Scranton (1868).

Official Catholic Directory; SHEA, *Life and Times of the Most Rev. John Carroll* (New York, 1888); BRADSBY, *History of Luzerne County* (Chicago, 1893); KIRLIN, *Catholicity in Philadelphia* (Philadelphia, 1909); LA ROCHEFOUCAULD-LIANCOURT, *Voyage dans les Etats-Unis d'Amérique* (Paris, 1799–1800); MURRAY, *The Story of Some French Refugees and their "Azilum"* (Athens, 1903).

6. Altoona (1901).

SHEEDY, *The Quarterly* (Altoona), October, 1901, VII, 263; IDEM, *The Observer*, Pittsburgh, 25 February, 1904; LAMBING, *History of the Diocese of Pittsburgh* (New York, 1880).

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here does not preclude notice in later issues of the* REVIEW)

Annual Report of the American Historical Association for year 1914. Compiled by DAVID MAYDOLE MATTESON. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1918. Pp. 793.

BAUSMAN, LOTTIE M. *A Bibliography of Lancaster County, Pennsylvania,* 1745–1912. Philadelphia: Patterson and White Co., 1916. Pp. iv+460.

D'ARLES, HENRI. *Acadie: Reconstitution d'un Chapitre perdu de l'Histoire d'Amérique.* Quebec and Boston: The Marlier Publishing Co. Vol. i, pp. 418,1916; Vol. ii, pp. 504, 1918.

DENSMORE, FRANCES. *Teton Sioux Music.* Washington, D. C.: Smithsonian Institute, Bureau of Ethnology, 1918. Pp. 561.

Discovery of America, 1492–1584, *The.* Edited by P. F. ALEXANDER, M.A. Cambridge: University Press, 1917. Pp. xviii+212.

FLINT, ZEBEDIAH. *Playing the Game.* New York Service. Pp. 63.

KELSEY, RAYNER WICKERSHAM, PH.D. *Friends and the Indians,* 1655–1917. Philadelphia: Associated Executive Committee of Friends on Indian Affairs, 1917. Pp. 291.

KYLE, MELVIN GRAVE, D.D., LL.D. *A New Solution of the Pentateuchal Problem.* Xenia, Ohio, 1918. (Reprint.) Pp. 31–212.

LATOURETTE, K. S. *The Development of Japan.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1918. Pp. xi+237.

LAVELL, CECIL FAIRFIELD, and PAYNE, CHARLES EDWARD. *Imperial England.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1918. Pp. 395.

LITTLE, A. G., M.A. *Studies in English Franciscan History.* New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1917. Pp. 248.

LUMMIS. *The Spanish Pioneers.* San Francisco. Pp. 292.

THE NEW CANON LAW AND ITS PRACTICAL ASPECTS. Philadelphia: The Dolphin Press, 1918. Pp. 192.

MARTON, OREN F., B.LITT. *A History of Monroe County, West Virginia.* Pp. 510.

MEANS, PHILIP AINSWORTH. *History of the Spanish Conquest of Yucatan and of the Itzas.* Cambridge: Published by the Museum, 1917. Pp. xv+206.

OGG, FREDERICK AUSTIN, PH.D. *National Progress,* 1907–1917. New York: Harper Brothers, 1918. Pp. 430.

PHILLIPS, ULRICH B., PH.D. *American Negro Slavery.* New York: D. Appleton, 1918. Pp. xi+529.

Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society, October 17, 1917. Vol. xxvii, Part II. Worcester: Published by Society, 1917. Pp. xxvi+275–524.

QUAIFE, MILO M. *Publications of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin.* Madison: Published by Society, 1918. Pp. 250.

RAVENEL, F. L. *Women and the French Tradition.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1918. Pp. ix+234.

Report of Commission on Religious Prejudices, 1915–16–17. Supreme Council, Knights of Columbus. Pp. 47 and 60.

Succession and Cooperation Movements in South Carolina, 1848–1852. Edited by C. S. Boucher. Concord: April, 1918. Pp. 67+138.

TOOHEY, JOHN J., S.J. *An Elementary Handbook of Logic.* New York: Schwarts, Kirwin and Fauss. Pp. xiv+241.

WILLIAMS, MICHAEL. *The Book of the High Romance.* New York: Macmillan Co., 1918. Pp. 350.

WOODSON, CARTER GOODWIN. *A Century of Negro Migration.* Washington, D. C. The Association for the Study of Negro Life and History, 1918. Pp. 221.